VOL. XX. No. 2 OCTOBER 1922 No. 78

THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY

PUBLISHED BY
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

The Theosophical Quarterly

Subscription price, $1.00 per annum; single copies, 25 cents

Published by The Theosophical Society of New York at Rumford Building, Ferry Street, Concord, New Hampshire, U. S. A.

July; October; January; April

Address all publication communications to the Theosophical Quarterly Publication Office, Concord, New Hampshire

Address all editorial communications to P. O. Box 64, Station O, New York

In Europe, single copies may be obtained from and subscriptions may be sent to John M. Watkins, 21 Cecil Court, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C. 2, England; or to Mr. E. H. Lincoln, 4 Sunningdale Avenue, Walker, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England, from whom all back numbers may be obtained. Annual subscription price, 6s., postpaid.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XX, No. 2

	PAGE
NOTES AND COMMENTS	97
FRAGMENTS	105
STUDENTS' SCRAP BOOK	106
A VEDIC MASTER (PRASHNA UPANISHAD)	115
THE DIRECTION OF HUMAN EVOLUTION	119
AKHNATON THE "HERETIC" PHARAOH, V	130
WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY	140
NIRVÂNA	144
THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS, XII (St. Ignatius Loyola)	154
TAO-TEH-KING, VII	163
ON THE SCREEN OF TIME	170
LETTERS TO STUDENTS	180
REVIEWS	187
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	190

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

The principal aim and object of this Society is to form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or colour. The subsidiary objects are: The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

Application pending for transfer of entry as second-class mail at the Post Office at Concord, N. H.

Copyright, 1922, by The Theosophical Society

PACIFIC COLLEGE
OCT 5 1922
LIBRARY

NOTES AND COMMENTS

OCTOBER, 1922

The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion, or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Russia and Ireland: A Study in Psychism

THE "realism" of the Russian novelists has many times been described as a new and characteristic quality in literature. It is worth considering in what exactly this realism consists. There is, as a background, a wonderfully vivid and vividly transmitted impression, not so much of nature, as of certain emotions evoked by Russian cities, Russian landscapes and above all the Russian sky, the vast dome, overwhelming in its immensity, arched above endless plains unbroken by even a hillock. The sky, whether cloudless or snow-swept, induces a keenly relished sense of loneliness and littleness, of the insignificance of man's personality. Turgenieff's *Diary of a Hunter* owes much of its distinctive character to this mirroring of the vast solitude of the sky, and to the beautifully drawn pictures of shadowy pine forests, which once again minister to a poignantly enjoyed melancholy. It is nature, not as expressing God's beauty, but as engendering a peculiar sadness, a sense of the piteousness of human life, a piercing emotion deeply delighted in like some penetrating and bitter cordial.

This is the background, against which move figures vibrant with emotions, felt with far more than the keenness of physical sensations; emotions predominantly painful, simply because painful feeling cuts deeper and thrills the psychic nature more potently than pleasure. What the Russian novelist is seeking, and very successfully seeking, is emotion as an excitant and intoxicant, emotion for emotion's sake.

Take for example Tolstoi's description of the passionate jealousy and frenzy of Anna Karenina, a bitterness of suffering that should call forth compassion. But Tolstoi depicts it not so much with compassion, as with a sheer relish for its intensity; it is made objective and local with the solidity of physical sensation, and at the same time with the fiery strength of brandy. Or take, in

sharp contrast, the motive of so many of Anton Chekhoff's comedies: a steady accession of hysteria, working up to an explosion; a psychic paroxysm, delighted in first because it creates a ludicrous situation, but far more because of its quality of broken and jarring vibration, which carries a keen sense of being vividly alive to a stolid elemental nature.

With music, the other art in which the Russians are eminent, it is exactly the same. So many of the folk songs of Northern and Central Russia, while they have their beauty and a marked national tone, are at the same time obsessed with piteousness, a piteousness which is once again not so much genuine compassion as poignant emotion, cherished for its penetrating keenness. At the opposite pole from these spontaneous and almost unconscious peasant songs there is the finished and conscious art of the *Pathetic Symphony*, with its wailing expression of the pitifulness of human life.

One is inclined to say that, in all this, there is no firmly held sense of the human personality, of man as a morally responsible being, but rather a succession of waves of emotion, for the most part painful; piteousness, poignancy, cherished melancholy, likely at any time to rise to a paroxysm. In a word, the kind of stimulant and intoxicant that an undeveloped and almost formless elemental nature craves, in order to rise to a climax of thrilled sensibility.

Here we have a clearly defined psychic nature, distinctively Russian. Let us see whether we can trace its influence and expression in the Russian revolution. To the making of this revolution, two elements appear to have contributed: the bitter Socialism of the Jew, Karl Marx, and the psychic response of the Russian artisans and peasants.

It has been well pointed out that much in Marxian Socialism may be directly explained by the race character of its author. The homeless Jew, who has no true sense of nationhood, but takes on, chameleon-like, the surface colouring of whatever country he finds himself in, is the almost predestined internationalist. For the most part not in touch with nature or occupied with vigorous physical activities, his life is largely on the psychic plane, and has a dominating psychic quality which tyrannously overmasters weaker races. He is intensely psychic also in the character of his motives and emotions: the sensuality, avarice and envy which are so vigorously depicted throughout the Old Testament. Internationalism, envy of every superiority, a greedy appetite for possessions, a sensual materialism: are not these the very stuff of the Marxian doctrine?

At the partition of Poland, Russia acquired a large territory which already had a dense Jewish population; German-speaking Jews who had found refuge under the comparatively tolerant laws of Poland. The truth is not so much that the Government of the Tsars developed a policy of pressure and persecution, but rather that it simply, perhaps with blameworthy indolence, tried to maintain the situation as it was, limiting the Jews to the districts in which they already were, and to the occupations they already exercised, in the ghettos of the Polish towns. A certain percentage were permitted to go to the

universities of Moscow and St. Petersburg, based on the proportion which the Jewish population held to the whole population of Russia.

To these same universities, in the years following the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861, by Alexander II, came the children of Russian peasants, with their intensely psychic and elemental natures; a class to whom what is called education, for the most part works sheer harm. Russian Revolutionary Socialism was engendered by these two elements, with a few of the upper class added; men and women in whom the explosive psychism of the Russian novelists was dominant. The psychic ferment thus set up in the social and political life of Russia culminated in 1881 in the murder of Alexander II, who had made all preparations, it is said on good authority, to give Russia a constitutional government.

Reaction came under Alexander III, a strong man, austere, intensely loving Russia, many of whose officials were without doubt corrupt and tyrannous, with the irresponsibility which has been the tragedy of so many of the ruling class in Russia. Nicholas II appears to have inherited the emotional idealism of his grandfather. The first Peace Conference at the Hague was of the same stuff as the Emancipation of the Serfs. Dominated at first by the policy of his father, Alexander III, a man of far stronger will, he in time revived the unfulfilled plan of his grandfather and, in 1906, Russia received a Constitution.

But the violent and explosive psychism of the Russian people was unable, and the inflamed fanaticism of the Revolutionary Socialists was unwilling to work out an ordered constitutional government; this feverish and contagious element remained as a pervading danger in Russia, an element of evil and harm sympathetically felt and understood by Germany. When the extremists in the Russian parliament demanded that Nicholas II should abdicate, and when, with a certain weak emotionalism, he acquiesced, the Germans saw their opportunity and sent Nicolai Lenin post haste to Russia, to carry to its logical conclusion what the doctrinary reformers had begun. For several months after the Emperor's abdication on March 15, 1917, Russia was flooded with idealistic illusions, against which was set off the arrogant vanity of Alexander Kerensky. Lenin and his murderous gang brought Russia back to realism and, as Lord Sydenham has shown, the nucleus of his supporters was made up of Marxian Jews, masquerading under borrowed Russian names.

The second element was contributed by the Russian artisans, who were able to act together because they were gathered together in the few factories of the larger towns. But these artisans were recent arrivals from the villages, and were made of the same elemental psychic material as the Russian peasants. The peasants had held their land by a communal tenure for ages, and had never developed the sense of individual responsibility and individual consciousness which grows up with the separate ownership of property. Elementals, recently evoked from the earth, they were obsessed by an intense land-hunger; and it needed only the spurious authority of the Revolutionists, to precipitate them in murderous attacks on the landowners, who, it must be said, had too

often felt no real sense of responsibility toward them. Among the Russian nobility, the landowners, there was far too little of *noblesse oblige.*

At any rate, they were murdered wholesale by the peasants, often with accompaniments of extreme brutality. In the narratives of these atrocious murders, there is just the same quality that has been described in Chekhoff's comedies: a steadily growing hysteria, rising to a paroxysm. The progression of psychic turmoil was exactly the same, though its colouring was that of tragedy.

The central power of the Russian revolution has remained in the hands of the Marxian Jews. It is a power of grasping destructiveness, the evil side of the psychic nature, and has been able tyrannously to dominate the Russian peasants, because the peasants, of softer and more pliant material, are at the same time intensely psychic. Of constructive ability, nothing appears to be left; Russia has knocked out her own brains. The artisans, who are in nature one with the peasants, slipped back into the psychic welter of their elemental nature as soon as the compulsion of their masters was removed, with the result that every constructive activity in Russia has gone to ruin, and practically nothing remains but the multitude of elemental peasants, still obsessed with land-hunger, under the vast, melancholy Russian sky. It may, perhaps, be hoped that the intense misery they are experiencing, as the inevitable result of the murderous paroxysms which possessed and devastated them, will bring them to a keener consciousness, making it possible for them to take a short cut to a more developed and responsible life.

There is one element in Russia of which we have not yet spoken: the national Church. On the one hand, it is true that Russian psychism plays its part here also, especially in the punctilious maintenance of an elaborate ritualism practically unchanged since Byzantine days, and insensibly mingling, among the peasants, with popular ceremonial magic. But it is equally true that the Russian Church has a heart of genuine devotion to its Master, with a real mysticism coming down from the Saints of the Eastern Church.

We may hope that the Church, against which the Marxian Jews have fought with brutal bitterness, will justify their malignant persecution by forming the central point of a reborn Russia, the spiritual triumphing over the psychical, the power of Christ conquering the destructive malice of the Marxian Jews and enabling the peasants to seek and find forgiveness for the murder of the landowners; so that this people, which has many virtues and much pristine strength, may be brought into an authentic humanity.

To turn now to the other country included with Russia in this study of psychism. Perhaps the best single sentence with which to describe the emotion of Ireland, is the line of a modern poet:

They went forth to battle, and they always fell . . .

This is the cult of the hero, the valiant fighting man, but a cult of heroism saturated with something of the piteousness, poignantly felt and deeply savoured, which we found in Russia. But there is another element, equally

psychic, which Russia lacks: the passionately dreaming individual, so enamoured of his own psychic vision that he cannot tolerate that other men should cherish a different vision of their own. It is not a spiritual quality, springing from the Oneness above, a quality that unites hearts and souls, but a psychic passion that sunders, with a fiery self-assertiveness that desires to pursue the dream of the other man and to destroy it, if need be, by destroying him.

It is worth noting that what is called religious intolerance seems never to have played a part in the history of Ireland. When Saint Patrick came, perhaps following earlier missionaries, he preached openly throughout the five kingdoms, having learned Irish in the days of his boyhood captivity. But he seems at no point to have been met with persecution or violence. His letters, with their mingling of autobiography and theology, in many ways recalling the Epistles of Saint Paul, have nothing to correspond with Paul's "stripes above measure, prisons more frequent." Nor, when the Christians became dominant, do they appear to have pursued the dwindling votaries of the older worship. It is the same thing through the Middle Ages and more modern times. Where no political question was involved, the bitter drop of *odium theologicum* did not flow in Irish veins.

Their intolerance was rather of other personalities, other local traditions, other fashions of dreams, than of other religious convictions. And only by reading the early traditions and Annals of Ireland, can we realize how intense, how incessant this intolerance of rival modes of dreaming was, with what fiery perpetuity it raged. Here is one year of many, in the earlier Christian period:

"Anno 526: The battle of Eiblinne, by Muirceartac son of Erc; the battle of Mag-Ailbe; the battle of Almain; the battle of Ceann-eic; the plundering of the Cliacs; and the battle of Eidne against the men of Connacht."

This is a representative year from the Gaelic *Annals of the Four Masters*. It is the same thing from the beginning. The first great epic story recounts the warring of Ulster with the South, and a splendid and terrible battle was then fought close to the line that is still in dispute on the Ulster frontier. Here is the martial summons of the King of Ulster, well nigh two thousand years ago:

"Have you not heard how the four provinces of Erin came against us, bringing with them their bards and singers, that their ravages and devastations might the better be recorded, and burning and plundering our fortresses and dwellings? Therefore I would make an expedition of hostility against them, and with your guidance and counsel would I make the expedition."

What could be more characteristic of Erin: "Bringing with them their bards and singers, that their ravages and devastations might the better be recorded?" And the dream of the bard ever echoes through the fighting:

"It is then that Conchobar's shield was battered and it moaned; so that the Three Waves of Erin moaned, the Wave of Clidna and the Wave Rudraige and the Wave of Tuag Inbir; so that the shields of the men of Ulster all moaned at that hour, every one of them that was on their shoulders and in their chariots." This is taken from a manuscript copied in the year 1150, but

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

the tale is a thousand years older. And here is another fragment, so old that none but antiquarians can render it:

> Earnestness of effort, to succour:
> Forgetfulness of honour: running against madmen;
> Shouting in distress;
> Meeting in disaster.

The dialect is archaic, but the feeling is of to-day. This was long centuries before the coming of the invader, in the golden age. But the invader's coming, invoked because of a conflict between the King of Connaught and the King of Leinster, did not impose a pale, oppressive peace on the Isle of Saints. Here is a passage from the Annals, under the year 1454:

"Rury and his army burned the great door of the castle, and set the stairs on fire; whereupon Donell, thinking that his life would be taken as soon as the army should reach the castle, it being his dying request, as he thought, entreated that he might be loosed from his fetters, as he deemed it a disgrace to be killed while imprisoned and fettered. His request was granted, and he was loosed from his fetters; after which he ascended to the battlements of the castle, to view the motions of the invading army. And he saw Rury beneath, with eyes flashing enmity, and waiting until the fire should subside, that he might enter and kill him. Donell then, finding a large stone by his side, hurled it directly down upon Rury, so that it fell on the crest of his helmet, on the top of his head, and crushed it, so that he instantly died. The invading forces were afterwards defeated, and by this throw Donell saved his own life and acquired the lordship of Tyrconnell."

So perished Rury's dream. And it should be remembered that this stirring and intensely national episode happened nearly three hundred years after the invader crushed the life of Ireland, in the mythical history of modern patriotism. This modern mythology was, however, composed in the true spirit of Irish psychism; in the spirit of the verse:

They went forth to battle, and they always fell . . .

Plenty of fighting, mingled with self-pity; the particular vintage of psychism that appeals to the craving for fiery self-assertiveness together with the passion for nursing a grievance.

During the eighteenth century, the penal laws against Roman Catholics, inspired largely by fear of intrigues with hostile nations on the Continent, were in force in Ireland. But they were equally in force in England. And the contrast between the emotional moods of the proscribed people in the two countries is worth noting. In Ireland, heroic tenacity, but heroism always saturated with self-conscious pathos, the psychic stimulant that Irishmen love to imbibe. In England, endurance, and a certain satirical protest, but no floods of self-pity. Waterton the naturalist was an English Roman Catholic of the penal days, but almost the only record of it in his books is his ironical

description of "the Hanoverian rat" which had invaded England, and in which he maliciously found a symbol of the Protestant House of Hanover.

Throughout the nineteenth century, in the honourable days when England enforced peace and respect for human life upon Irishmen, the age-old love of fighting, the cult of martyrdom, was forced to find a less deadly outlet. This it found in faction-fighting, when any pretext, however fantastic, such as the feud between the "two year olds" and the "three year olds" sufficed for a rallying cry.

Here, by way of illustration, is a ballad, touched with the humour that seems to have died in these days of militant nationalism, but expressing also the two psychic elements that we have traced: the passion of intolerant self-assertion and the passion of self-pity so deeply characteristic of the Irish character:

'Twas September fair day,
  And the Adragole faction
Wid Dereen for the green
  And the bridge were in action;
And from off the bridge road,
  Wid his cudgel so clever,
Bat was leatherin' a load
  Of Cork men for ever,
Just as if it was play.

When up from beneath,
  Still further and further,
Houldin' tight in his teeth
  A stick that was murther,
That black tinker stole,
  By the ivy boughs clingin'
On the edge of the bridge
  The knees softly swingin';
And, unknownst at his back,
  From the wall of the river
Fetched O'Kearney a crack,
  That left him for iver
Wid a poor, puzzled poll.

Did he fall? Not at all!
  But he picked off that tinker
Like a snail from the wall
  And before you could think or
Repate your own name,
  Cot the stick from the ruffi'n,
Knocked him dead on the head,
  And without shroud or coffin
Tossed him into the tide.

And his black corpse for ever
From Ireland should glide,
For her good soil could never
Cover up such a shame. . . .

With only the key transposed, this is the story of five hundred years earlier, the story of Rury and Donell, "Rury beneath, with eyes flashing enmity." And give these same faction fighters rifles and machine guns, as has seemed good to the present custodians of England's honour, and you will have exactly what is going on to-day.

It is worth while to present this passion of psychic self-assertiveness in a setting of comedy, though the comedy is tempered with pity for the madness of the hero, whose "poor, puzzled poll" never recovered its sanity; it is worth while to strip off the swathings of self-pitying emotionalism, because we may thus come to realize what a potent part this contagious self-pity has played in making "the wrongs of Ireland" a factor in international politics; self-pity and deep enjoyment of a grievance.

It is significant that the rallying cry of Ireland in the twentieth century has been *Sinn Fein*, "We ourselves!" And it is even more significant that this spirit of flaunted egotism blinded those who were obsessed by it to the existence of any issue between the eternal forces of Good and Evil, in the World War; so blinded them that in 1916, in the dark days of the war, their nationalism inspired them to send an ambassador to Berlin, and to strike in the back the cause of the Allies. Most significant of all is it that this malignant treachery has already gathered about it clouds of mock tragedy, enshrining it in the sacred history of the nation.

We shall be well advised to take to heart the deadly character of psychism, whether in Russia or in Ireland; its demoniac power to blind the spirit of man to every principle of truth and honour. When it takes the form of violent and dreamy self-assertiveness, saturated with strong doses of self-pity, it is capable of every cruelty and treachery.

It is of value to study these factors of human life in the large, manifested by whole nations, only if we complete the process by seeking exactly the same elements in ourselves. Egotism and self-pity are in the germ, where they are not already well grown, in us also; finally to uproot them is a task that only divine grace can render possible.

To be free, means to direct by duly meditated choice, our feelings, our thoughts our actions. — PAYOT.

FRAGMENTS

HUSH. Listen.
Across my heart ghostly bugles are sounding.
Hush. Listen again.

What is that rhythmical beat we are hearing?

Tramp, tramp, tramp, as if from a far, far distance, but steadily, steadily, slowly but surely approaching, approaching — the feet of marching men.

They come, looming up from the mist, with the mist about them; silent and set and steady; in perfect alignment; no quiver, no change. The mist circles about them clinging and grey, — they are part of its shadows.

Onward they come, by hundreds, by thousands, by millions — a long steady stream, unbroken, unbreakable.

Who are they, O heart — this invincible army?

The question lights up a flame in their eyes, and illumines their faces.

We are they — say those faces — who died on the fair fields of France and of Flanders. We died for the world, for Right, for Truth and for Honour. We died that Ideals might live, — that men to come after should reap where we sowed. We died to repel the barbarian, died to drive back the Horror, died to save civilization. We laid down our lives for various symbols and names, — but now we have knowledge. It was Christ and his kingdom we saved, — Christ and his kingdom *are saving*. Some heard the call from the uttermost depths of hell and damnation, and, hearing, responded — to fight on forever.

O recruits of St. Michael, reserves of high Heaven, what dangers can live in the breath of your valour? Chaos and darkness below, and the din of our madness; but there, through it all, is the tramp of your marching, there is the flame in your eyes, O warriors superb! there is the power in your hearts, born of love and self-giving — born of conflict and triumph.

These are the hosts who have challenged the demons of Hell; before whom its gates shall be shattered, its prisons be emptied; that angels may plant there and build for the souls who are coming.

* * * * * * * *

In the gleam of the monuments erected in their honour, in the echo of the cheers that have hardly died away, still moistened with the tears which have fallen on their graves, — they are stern, because they know the cheapness of such tributes, from those who trample in the mud the things they pledged themselves to save.

Beware, O you who have forgotten! these men do not forget. With the rhythm of their marching they will shake your crude foundations, where your temple of dishonour rises mocking God's blue sky.

CAVÉ.

STUDENTS' SCRAP BOOK

Knowledge

I AM appalled by the extent to which what I know exceeds what I use. It is a truism that knowledge entails responsibility, and represents capital upon which interest must be paid. With most of us, the greater part of it is borrowed capital; not something we have earned for ourselves — the slow savings of experience — but something we have received in trust from our teachers and predecessors to be invested in our lives. It appears on both sides of the balance sheet, and is quite as much a liability as an asset. When we let it lie idle the interest charges accumulate with no earnings to offset them, so that the net result is loss, not gain. It is the parable of the buried talent, over again; and when I view my life in such business terms I am forced to realize that my most pressing problem is not to secure more capital, but to use more profitably what I already have — increasing the "turnover."

Unity, Immanence, and Transcendence

Essential Unity is the fundamental principle of Theosophy. The universe is one, a unit, though it manifest itself through infinite diversity.

As this is the fundamental principle of Theosophy, it should be the foundation of my own thinking. Or rather, it should be the seed and *root* of my thinking; for fundamental principles should not be to thought as inert foundation stones to a superstructure reared upon them. Thought should emanate from principle as the oak from the acorn, as an exfoliation of its content, controlled and vitalized, in each of its branches, not only by the air and light it seeks, but also by the life currents rising from its roots and returning to them. It is right, therefore, that my thought should return again and again to this fundamental principle, as the sap to the roots of a tree; and each time that it does so I find my understanding quickened and I see more deeply into the meaning of my own life and of the universal life of which I am a part.

The definitive characteristic of an infinite totality is that it is self-representative, containing within itself an infinite number of infinite parts, each part being a perfect picture, in its own particular way, of the whole of which it is a part. The mathematical illustration of the whole-number system

N 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, . . .

is perhaps as simple as any. Clearly this system is endless; since however great a number we conceive, we can always add one to it, and so obtain a still greater number. All the whole-numbers taken together, therefore, constitute an infinite totality, and so should contain an infinite number of infinite parts, all picturing, in their own particular way, the whole of which they are parts. The multiples of two, or three, or seven, or of any other number, are examples of such parts.

Two	2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, . . .
Three	3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, . . .
Seven	7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, . . .

Each of these sequences is clearly but a part of the whole-number sequence N. The whole *transcends* its part, containing elements which are not manifest in the part. For example, the numbers 5, 11, 13, do not appear in the sequences of twos or threes or sevens. Yet each of these sequences is a perfect picture of the whole, and contains the whole *immanent* within it. The sequence of twos pictures the whole through its "twoness"; the sequence of sevens pictures it through "sevenness." If we divide each element of the sequence of twos by two, the whole reappears. For taking

2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, . . .

and dividing by two, we have the whole, N,

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, . . .

Within the "twoness," the "threeness," or the "sevenness" which characterize the part, the whole lies concealed.

This is a true symbol of every living thing — of every individuality whatsoever. It is but a *part* of the infinite divine life, yet in its own individual and unique way it reflects the *whole* of divine life; and if we look within that individuality we find the whole of divine life immanent therein.

Our individuality is our unique way of mirroring the infinite whole of which we are a part. We can never know truly anyone or anything, whether ourself or another, whether friend or foe or "inanimate" object, till we see the divine immanent within it.

There can be nothing in the manifested or unmanifested universe, whether divine or demoniacal, spiritual or material, force or consciousness, which has not its correspondence in man, and which I myself do not in some way picture and reflect.

The whole of divine life is immanent within me — the strength of mountains and tempest, the fineness of touch of a moth on a flower, the dignity of stars, are mine to evoke and to use. "All nature reveals to me my own nature."

Cycles and Rhythm

I am never sure what others mean when they use the word God. I am never sure what I mean when I use it. Whatever they, or I, mean by it seems of necessity beyond verbal definition. But in my own thought it stands, in some general way, for the Unity of the Universe, for That from which the universe emanates, which transcends the universe and is immanent in it and in each part of it; and to which I seem to look both when my meditation strives to follow the ascending hierarchy of divine Life, from where I stand upward through the great Lodge of Masters, Dhyan Chohans, and Planetary Spirits to That which they embody, reflect, and serve; and also whenever I strive to penetrate to the ultimate essence of anything at all. Perhaps for me no other word is so nearly synonymous with God as the word Life — in the sense of the

Life principle — which lives in me, and in all, and in which we "live and move and have our being."

I am recording this because I have been thinking of the cyclic law which governs the action of the life principle, but which I should never think of as governing God. Whatever I mean by God is above law, above cycles, changeless though manifesting in change — so that the precession of the cycles appears as a rhythm of consciousness successively manifesting different levels, different tones and chords of the Divine Being.

The same notes played in a different sequence, the same words arranged in a different order, make the difference between one piece of music and another, between harmony and discord, between truth and falsity. As I may view life in terms of force or form or consciousness, so I may view it in terms of rhythm — of cycles — and consider the difference between individuals as a difference of the underlying and sustaining rhythm — as, in the illustration of the number system, the sequence of twos and threes and sevens typified distinct individual representations of the whole. It would be a very limited way of viewing life and individuality, but it might suggest aspects of truth we rarely consider; and in the superposition of a minor rhythm upon a fundamental one, we might find analogies for sympathy and the process by which meditation attunes the consciousness to the subject of our consideration, till we know it by *becoming it.*

Thus "Seven"

7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, . . .

might "know" "Three" by superimposing upon its own fundamental rhythm of seven, the minor rhythm of three, presenting to consciousness the sequence

21, 42, 63, 84, . . .

of which each element is seven times the three sequence

3, 6, 9, 12, . . .

Many similar analogies suggest themselves, and some of them throw a new, cold light upon emotional processes that we more often observe only in heat. But the symbolism seems too remote and mechanical to do more than furnish an outline sketch — a working drawing — to guide our thought in its efforts to lay hold upon the vital realities of experience.

Alchemy — The Key-note of a New Cycle

When Emerson wrote that in each atom the whole universe contrives to integrate itself, science regarded the atom as an indivisible unit — which might thus correspond to the essential unity of the universe, but which certainly did not reflect its infinite multiplicity and the variety of its manifestation. With the discovery of radio-activity, however, the old theory of the indivisibility of the atom had to be abandoned, for the atom was breaking down before our eyes. To-day science sees it as a solar system of electric particles, "electrons" or "ions," — a central nucleus around which revolve a multitude of oppositely charged particles, as planets around a central sun. The number and grouping of these planetary particles — which, with the central nucleus,

constitute, in general, a self-contained system in dynamic equilibrium — determine the chemical nature of the atom, which thus remains the same so long as the grouping remains the same. But if a particle for any reason fails to keep to its orbit, and shoots off, instead, like a comet (as in the case of radium), then the equilibrium of the whole system is destroyed, the orbits alter and the grouping changes. The atom is no longer what it was. Instead of an atom of radium it becomes an atom of something else, and the transmutation of one chemical element into another is an accomplished fact. It is true that science has not yet learned to produce this change at will, but physicists and chemists are working at the problem all over the world, imitating with "sincerest flattery" the alchemists of the Middle Ages whom they so long scouted and ridiculed as deluded dreamers.

There are, however, two significant differences between these modern and the ancient alchemists. The first is that the alchemy of the present has so far succeeded in demonstrating only the disintegration of the atom, not its integration. The transmutations observed are all in a single direction along the chemical scale; and if continued would change gold into lead — not lead into gold. Though atoms have been bombarded by electrons shot off from radioactive substances, so far as I know no modern scientist has yet succeeded in making of such a flying comet a new planet in another atomic system. The bombardment may break down the atom subjected to it, but it does not "step it up"; and this "stepping up," this acquisition of new elements and assimilating them into a new dynamic equilibrium, is precisely what must take place if the present scientific theories be correct, before lead can be turned into gold.

The second significant difference between the modern alchemists and the old, lies in their breadth of view, and their concepts of the nature of the problem they set themselves. The chemist looks upon the atom as a thing in itself, isolated, — which he can transmute and disintegrate, and perhaps integrate again, without effect upon himself or the rest of nature and of life. There is every reason to believe, on the other hand, that the alchemist regarded his study of the atom as but a key to a far wider mastery — a universal mastery — of nature, his own nature included. He was imbued with the truth of Emerson's dictum. To him the atom was a perfect picture of the whole of nature. Could he learn to "step it up," to transmute base substance into precious metal, the secret of life would be in his hands, and it would be to himself that he would first apply the process — becoming thereby immortal, eternally young and divine. The search for the transmutation of metals and for "the philosophers' stone" was one and the same.

As I, too, believe in Emerson's statement — which is but a rephrasing of the first principle of Theosophy — I am interested in noting how many indications there are that this observed breaking-down and transmutation of the atom is not an isolated phenomenon, but corresponds with and is only a picture of, what is happening all about me, and in such a wide variety of fields that it appears to be a turning of a world tide — a movement of human consciousness

into a deeper level of nature, where what was before seen as one and indivisible is now seen as multiple, and not only capable of division but as being divided.

Following the direct lead of the alchemists, I think first of human nature, its instincts, motives, habits, memories, traditions, character. Here the correspondence is no sooner suggested than it seems obvious and verified. The new school of psycho-analysis is doing for our sub-conscious self precisely what physical chemistry is doing for the atom; and to that extent, at least, is following in the foot-steps of Theosophy. It is revealing the sub-conscious not as a single, homogeneous and indivisible entity, but as a congeries of different nuclei to which have been attracted, and around which revolve, highly charged emotional elements, whose groupings and orbits and dynamic equilibrium — stable or unstable — determine character, and health, and action. It has disclosed a new world to psychology, and has opened a path whereby it is able consciously and purposefully to penetrate into the inner gravitational forces of our nature, and to alter the inner equilibrium. Inner stress and strain have been lessened; psychic "complexes" resolved into their component parts, and the man's outer actions or health thus liberated from their influence. The way to this knowledge was opened by the phenomena of neurosis — of divided will and character — and its effects seem to me to have been chiefly along the same line of division. Its advocates claim the opposite, and that its aim is the reintegration of a divided personality. But where it appears to accomplish this, it seems to be because one of two conflicting elements has been disintegrated, leaving the other free and untrammelled. If it was a hurtful, evil element, this may, perhaps, be real gain. But it is none the less disintegration — the step-down process observed in the transmutation of the atoms.

Though I believe that this statement is generally true of the results of psycho-analysis as invented and practised by Freud and Jung and their disciples, I should not wish to apply it to the whole new school of psychology which deals with the sub-conscious — to the practical applications of the work of Bergson, for instance, or to that of Coué and the new Nancy school.

It amuses me to draw another correspondence here, and to consider each of these workers I have named, as typifying, in his own person and work, the genius of his race and country. Freud is an Austrian Jew. The Jews know no nationality; for when they rejected Christ they rejected the central nucleus of the true spirit of their race, and without their nucleus they can no more hold together than could the electrons of an atom — or a solar system without a sun — nor can they ever be really assimilated into any other unity. On the other hand, as Gustave Le Bon has put it, "The Austrian Empire was based upon an equilibrium of hatreds." As one reads Freud's books one is impressed by the extent to which these characteristics of his birth colour his whole view of the inner nature of man. He sees the conflicts, the warring desires, the irreconcilable aspirations and instincts, the deadlock of mutual hate, existing between the elements of a man's psychic nature as between the different racial stocks that entered into the Austrian hegemony. The unity into which they should be transformed, the unity of the soul itself, to establish

which is the aim of life, he seems largely to ignore — as the Jew commonly is blind to the unity of spirit which is the basis of patriotism. Scattered throughout the world, the Jews' primary interest is in elements that are international: in commerce, science, art, music, pleasure, sensuality, money. So Freud, despite what would undoubtedly be his genuine disclaimer, appears to focus his attention not upon the man, but upon the tendencies and desires that enter into all our common nature; and his concern seems to be to give these freer play, liberating into what he regards as normal channels of expression or sublimation the suppressed impulse of sex or other instinct whose pressure is proving troublesome, — with little real understanding of the nature of the self or what may be the ultimate effect of such liberation upon it. He sees only that which comes from below; nothing from above.

Turning to Jung, we think of the Swiss confederation, whose bond of union is largely geographical. His method of association seems based upon a similar principle of contiguity. It is not oneness of aim or tradition, of race or language, that counts — but juxtaposition.

Bergson is a French Jew. It would take me too far afield to try to deal here with the correspondences I believe might be drawn from his philosophic theories of intuition and memory and the *élan vital*. Both the spirit of the Jew and the spirit of France seem to me manifest; but the correspondence would be with the best, rather than what is worst, in Jewish internationalism.

Coué is a French nationalist, and he alone of those I have named seems to base his method upon the *wholeness* of the self, and upon trust in its essential integrity. His is not a method of analysis, nor of disintegration. It is a method of action, formulated first on a clear vision of his immediate goal and a just appreciation of where he stands in relation to it; and, second, on faith in his ability to attain it. In many ways it seems characteristic of the present genius and spirit of France.

But I must return to my main theme. The movement of science that has led us to see the atom as a congeries, the movement of the life principle that is showing us, in a certain section of the scale of elements, the atom's disintegration, are typical of the movement of consciousness and of life throughout the world. We are penetrating more and more deeply into the invisible, the intangible, the undivided and the unconscious, and we are finding it becoming visible, tangible, divided and conscious. We are laying our hands upon hitherto hidden centripetal forces that have held our unities together. We are entering a new level of nature, a new plane of being — the sub-atomic plane, to use the atom as the symbol both of matter and of individuality and unity of every kind. We are at the dawn of a new cycle. What is it to be?

Thinking of this, I remembered Madame Blavatsky's many statements of the ether and the sub-atomic forces of Âkâsa, and there came to my mind one which I have verified as from a footnote on page 13 of the first volume of *The Secret Doctrine* (1888 Ed.). Speaking of Âkâsa it says, "In its higher aspect it is the Soul of the World; in its lower — the *Destroyer*."

There must be these two aspects: new opportunity, new integration, new

growth, new life in greater abundance, wherever the soul is dominant and free to work its divine alchemy, transmuting base metal into gold; and where not the soul but evil is dominant, where the soul has been rejected and denied, there must be destruction, disintegration, a falling away from life, and these new levels opened only to become materialized.

It is easy to see the action of the Destroyer. It is painfully obvious over the whole face of the world. We have seen it in the atom. We have seen it in the lives of those who have used the Freudian teaching as an excuse for license — in the thought, to which youth is always tempted but which is particularly prevalent to-day, that self-expression means the spontaneous indulgence of the diverse animal instincts, rather than the controlled and purposed action of a unified self.

We can see it as well in the world of politics and of nations. Great empires are dissolving before our eyes, breaking into their component parts. Russia and Austria most spectacularly, but Turkey, China, and even the British Empire, seem hastening along the same road, in which to stop and turn becomes more difficult as the decline becomes steeper. England! Those who love it cannot speak of it without conscious pain. It stood for so much that we revered and honoured, that we were proud was in our blood as a source of inspiration and of strength, — for law and order and stability, for the spirit of adventure and *noblesse oblige* and heroic stedfastness so splendidly manifest in war, for the power of dignity and tradition and freedom realized through self-restraint; — and now, war weary, her best lives given to the "Army of the Dead," her destinies guided by a Welsh psychic to whom principles are but counters for bargaining, her aristocracy silent, no longer believing in itself — now she turns from her own soul and justifies the ancient taunt of the scorner, that she is but a nation of shop-keepers. No shop-keeper can hold the British Empire together. It has not been her commerce but her younger sons who held India loyal to England; and without them India will go the way of Egypt and of Ireland. It is painfully easy to see the work of the Destroyer here.

But we can trace it also within our own country. For a generation we have watched and listened to paid agitators preaching class consciousness and class antagonism, under a constitution that was supposed to know no classes or class distinctions. The arts of the demagogue have been made a science, and their influence intensified a thousand times through our system of popular education and the press. We have placed it in the power of men of alien race, tradition, and ideals, to act directly on the ties that bind the diverse elements of our national life into a single unity, and the inevitable result has been to loosen these ties or sever them. Instead of a union, "one and indivisible," we have warring groups of labour organizations, dictating the laws which Congress is to pass, or disrupting by their independent action, exercised for their own fancied interest and aggrandizement, the whole dynamic equilibrium of our economic life. Or again, turning from our internal to our international relations, we see that strange obverse of idealism which would forgive its unrepentant enemies, but would quarrel with its loyal friends — which

makes no claim on Germany but which demands the last cent from France. Surely here, too, is the action of the Destroyer, severing unities, working disintegration.

When I think of this world-wide disintegration, manifesting thus in physics and chemistry, psychology and politics, music and literature and art — for what else is the modern "Jazz," and "free verse," and ultra impressionism, but disintegration? — I am tempted to wonder whether the time was ripe for the movement which causes it, or whether it was precipitated in advance of its time through the deliberate efforts of the powers of evil. Perhaps this sudden, rapid penetration of consciousness into deeper levels of life, this bursting open of the seals of knowledge long kept secret — this new gift given to mankind at large to affect the most vital and intimate ties of the inner life of men and nations and nature — perhaps this may be such a gift as Germany gave Russia, when Lenin was sent to Petrograd with German gold and German backing to "liberate" and "free" the country, to show how to sever the bonds of its unity, destroy its equilibrium and regroup its elements. I do not know.

But this I do know. Whether this opening of a new cycle comes at its appointed time, or whether it was precipitated prematurely by the action of the Black Lodge, it will be used by the White Lodge for its own ends and purposes. The Black Lodge can forge no weapon, however potent for evil when acting on evil, that, in the hands of the White Lodge, does not become yet more potent for good when acting on the good. If, in its lower aspects, this new cycle seems to manifest the action of the "Destroyer," in its higher aspects it must manifest the action of the "Soul of the World."

Perhaps to our vision the lower aspect must be the most prominent, because nearest to us. Perhaps it must come first in time — destruction of the old preceding the birth of the new. It is worth remembering that the alchemy which sought the soul, which worked by integration and construction, did not mark the decline and breaking up of the Roman civilization, but rose into sight in those so-called "Dark Ages" when the separated elements of the old were being reformed and regrouped to build the new. Here again the atom was the picture of the whole.

But I cannot take this to mean that destruction and disintegration must proceed and run their course. It must be precisely when the cycle turns, when failure threatens and seems imminent, that the greatest opportunity for victory is present. In the unstable equilibrium that leads to disintegration, is the opportunity, if we but see and seize it, to integrate upon a higher plane — to introduce a new "electron" into the atom's planetary system and thus "step up" the whole.

The question of success or failure must thus be answered by another question, for the determining factor must lie in whether the new element to be incorporated is present and ready when the old order gives way. This is why I should expect that the Black Lodge would do all in their power to hasten the crisis, and why I am inclined to believe that much of our new knowledge and power to

disintegrate comes from them. But even so, the White Lodge have been before them. The new element is here — already working in the minds and hearts of men and women, however few and insignificant they may appear.

It was to provide this new element that the Theosophical Society was founded. It was for this that Madame Blavatsky, Judge, and the roll of our dead gave up their lives — and they did not live and die in vain. The Theosophical Society has succeeded. The Movement has survived the end of the old cycle and pours its quickening life into the new. In it is the new ingredient — the faith, proved and verified, "that the inner world can be entered here and now, that knowledge exists and is obtainable, that chêlaship is a present day possibility and fact." It may be said that there are as yet but few who have this faith. Be it so. Yet the little leaven leaveneth the whole lump; and experience has proved, over and over again through the forty-seven years of the Society's existence, that the understanding and knowledge possessed by its members spread by contagion to the world at large. Its action may take time — as it took three years to bring this country into the war — but it is none the less sure. The new element is here.

Time! In the Theosophical Society as in all warfare it appears as the crucial element in every strategy. We have been bidden to take long views, but it is only in retrospect that we can glimpse something of the far perspective which our generals must use in timing and planning their campaigns. A moment ago I wrote the names of Madame Blavatsky and Mr. Judge, the one a Russian, the other an Irishman. It cannot be without significance that these two messengers of the Lodge were chosen from the two countries most bent on self-destruction, and which have now fallen into completest anarchy. To us the collapse is a thing of yesterday, unforetold a short decade ago, for we could not then read the signs we may now see were present. But to the Lodge it must have been foreseen far back of 1875; and in their choice of agents they must have looked forward not only to the *débâcle* but to its consequences in centuries yet to come. We know how their magnanimity ever reaches down to the lowest levels open to them, and uses the humblest instruments for the greatest work. Drawing Judge and Madame Blavatsky from Ireland and Russia was like finding and drawing the spark of good from some human derelict, condemned before the court of justice, and using it as a plea for mercy and a new chance. In the far spaces of time, in some new incarnation of what was once Ireland and Russia, it may constitute a Karmic debt that will enable the Lodge to aid and save them. Perhaps, too, we can see, in this choice, evidence for the support of the thesis that in the unstable equilibrium which precedes disintegration, the greatest opportunity is offered for reintegration on a new and higher plane.

But be this as it may, the Lodge gift, brought by its messengers to the world, is still here. The cycle opens. Its key-note is alchemy. It is for each one of us to determine in what direction that alchemy shall act in him — for the way in both directions lies wide open.

H. B. M.

A VEDIC MASTER

PRASHNA UPANISHAD

Translated from the Sanskrit with an Interpretation

II

And so Gargya, grandson of Surya, asked him:

Master, in the man here, which powers sleep, and which wake in him? Which is the bright one who beholds dreams? Whose is this happiness? In what are all these bright powers set firm?

To him he said:

As, Gargya, the rays of the sun going to his setting all become one in his radiant circle, and again, when he rises again, they go forth, thus, verily, all this becomes one in the higher bright power, Mind. Because of this then the man hears not, sees not, smells not, tastes not, speaks not, handles not, enjoys not, puts not forth, walks not; he sleeps, they say.

The life-fires, verily, wake in this dwelling; the household fire, verily, is the downward-life; the sacrificial fire is the distributing-life; because it is brought forward from the household fire, from being brought forward, the fire of oblation is the forward-life. The binding-life is so called because it binds together the up-breathing and the down-breathing, the two oblations. Mind, verily, is the sacrificer. The fruit of the sacrifice is the upward-life. Day by day it brings the sacrificer to the Eternal. Here this bright power in dream experiences greatness; what was seen, as seen he beholds again; what was heard, he hears again, verily, as an object heard; what has been experienced by the different powers in their regions, he again perceives according to each power, the seen and unseen, the heard and unheard, the experienced and unexperienced, the real and unreal; all he perceives, as the All he perceives.

When he is enveloped by the radiance, the bright power then beholds no dreams; and so then in this body that happiness arises. As, dear, the birds come home to the tree to rest, so, verily, all this comes to rest in the Higher Self: earth and forms of earth, water and forms of water, fire and forms of fire, air and forms of air, radiant ether and forms of radiant ether, sight and what is to be seen, hearing and what is to be heard, the power of smell and what is to be smelled, taste and what is to be tasted, touch and what is to be touched, voice and what is to be spoken, the two hands and what is to be handled, the formative power and what is to be formed, the power which puts forth and what is to be put forth, the two feet and the power of going, the mind and what is to be thought, the intelligence and what is to be understood, self-reference and what is referred to self, imagination and what can be imagined, the radiance and what can be illumined, the life-breath and what can be supported.

For it is he who sees, touches, hears, smells, tastes, thinks, understands, acts, the

Self of understanding, the spiritual man; he is set firm in the higher, imperishable Self.

He reaches the higher imperishable, who, verily, knows that shadowless, bodiless, colourless, radiant, imperishable; he, dear, knowing all, becomes All. And there is this verse:

The Self of understanding with all the bright powers,
All lives and beings are set firm in this;
He, dear, who knows this imperishable,
He, knowing all, has entered the All.

THE six questions addressed to the Vedic Master, with their answers, form an ordered sequence which outlines the whole of the Mystery teaching. The first answer teaches the emanation of the manifested universe and all worlds and beings therein through the Logos, "the Lord of beings." There is also an outline of the twin doctrines of liberation and reincarnation. The second answer sketches what we are accustomed to call the Seven Principles, both of the worlds and of man; the inferior principles being but aspects and manifestations of the one Divine Principle. In the third answer, the teaching of the Principles is further developed through their correspondence with the life-forces of the body, which are manifestations of the one Life.

The fourth question and answer, translated above, lead to the consideration of the planes of consciousness which are treated more fully in the answer to the fifth question.

The disciple asks concerning sleep. The Master answers, going back for his guiding thought to the first teaching, the manifestation of the worlds and man through the out-breathing of the Logos. As there is an out-breathing, so there is also an in-drawing. For the worlds, this in-drawing comes at the end of the world-period; for man, it comes at death, as has already been told in the second answer. But there is also sleep, the sister of death, in which the same in-drawing takes place, though it is an in-drawing of consciousness and not of substance. The body is not dissolved as in death, but sinks into a torpor, awaiting the return of the powers on awaking. The body thus resting, with its powers indrawn, is likened to the house with its sacrificial fires; and the process of going to sleep is compared to a sacrifice, whose reward is the upward tide of aspiration, which carries the consciousness upward toward spiritual life.

But the mid-world must first be passed through, the realm of dreams. We are told that the scenery of the dream-world is made up of the images of things seen and heard and diversely perceived in the realm of waking. These images are reflected from below. But there are also reflections from above, images of things not seen nor heard in the world of waking; spiritual images which should lead the consciousness upward to the living, spiritual world; images of beauty, truth and goodness, reflections of immortal Beauty, Truth and Goodness. That living, spiritual world is the dwelling of the Higher Self, the Immortal, which has put forth Mind and the bright powers into the manifested world as its servants, to do its bidding and reap its harvests.

And just as sleep is, in a sense, a rehearsal of death, so this ascension of the consciousness in sleep is a foreshadowing of the final ascent of consciousness in the great Liberation, which is the true theme of all Mystery teachings.

And so Satyakama, son of Shiva, asked him:

Master, he who among the sons of men should meditate on Om until his life's end, which of the worlds does he thereby win?

To him he said:

Om, Satyakama, is the higher and lower Eternal. Therefore he who knows, resting in this, comes to one of these worlds.

If he meditate on one measure, thereby illumined he quickly returns to this world. The Rig verses lead him to the world of men; there endowed with fervour, service of the Eternal, faith, he experiences greatness.

And so if he be possessed of two measures in his mind, he is led by the Yajur verses to the mid-world, the lunar world. Having enjoyed expansion in the lunar world he returns again.

Again, he who meditates on this Om with three measures, and, through this Om, on the higher spiritual man, enveloped in the radiance, in the sun, like as a serpent is released from its slough, so is he released from the darkness of sin; he is led up by the Sama verses to the world of the Eternal; he perceives the Spiritual Man, who is above the highest assembly of lives. As to this, there are these verses:

The three measures, subject to death, are united, joined together, not disunited.

When the outer, inner and middle are perfectly joined together in acts of meditation, the knower is not shaken.

By the Rig to this world, by the Yajur to the mid-world, by the Sama to the world the seers know; to that world, resting in Om, goes he who knows, to that which is full of peace, ageless, immortal, fearless.

The syllable Om is made up of three measures: a-u-m. These are taken to represent the three states of consciousness, physical, psychical, spiritual; united together, as Om, they represent the divine consciousness. As a secondary symbolism, the three Vedas, the Rig, Yajur and Sama Vedas, are taken, likewise standing for the three states of consciousness; the Veda, as a unity, standing for the divine consciousness.

Consciousness limited to the physical is represented by the first measure of Om; since there is no subjective life in such a case, nothing to build the scenery of the paradise between death and rebirth, such a one is reborn forthwith.

The added subjective, but not yet spiritual, consciousness, is represented by the second measure of Om. At death, such a one goes to the "lunar" paradise, so called because it shines by reflected light and, after waxing, will wane again.

Spiritual consciousness is represented by the third measure of Om. The radiance is the Principle called Buddhi; the sun is the Logos. Through the illumination of Buddhi, he is united with the Logos, this union being Liberation. The Logos, whom Shankaracharya calls "the First-born," is the Spiritual Man, above the highest assembly of lives.

It is the teaching of the Upanishads that man in sleep enters the spiritual

consciousness, but that, passing downward again through the mid-world, the world of dreams, he loses all remembrance of that consciousness; so far as his outer knowledge is concerned, spiritual consciousness comes to an end when the man returns to waking consciousness. Therefore all three, physical, psychical and spiritual consciousness, have their ending for him; they are "subject to death." But they are perfectly united through meditation, through spiritual illumination; the spiritual man, dwelling in spiritual consciousness, uses psychical and physical consciousness for the purposes of his work, while standing unshaken in the spiritual world. This is the ageless, immortal, fearless world, his everlasting home.

And so Sukeshan, son of Bharadvaja, asked him:

Master, Hiranyanabha of the Koshalas, the Rajput, coming to me, asked me this question: Son of Bharadvaja, knowest thou the Man of sixteen parts? I said to the prince, I know him not; if I knew him, how should I not tell him to thee? He dries up, root and all, who speaks untruth, therefore I deign not to speak untruth. Ascending his chariot in silence, he departed. I ask thee this: Where is that Man?

To him he said:

Here, verily, within the body, dear, is the Man in whom the sixteen parts are manifested.

He, beholding, thought: In what going forth shall I go forth? Or in what set firm shall I be set firm?

He put forth the Life; from the Life, faith, ether, air, fire, the waters, the earth, the powers, mind, food, also came forth; from food, valour, fervour, the sacred verses, works, the worlds; and name also in the worlds.

As these rolling rivers, flowing oceanward, reaching the ocean, find there their setting; their name and form are lost and they are called ocean; so of this seer, the sixteen parts, moving toward the Spiritual Man, on reaching the Spiritual Man, find their setting; their name and form are lost and they are called the Spiritual Man: so he becomes partless, immortal. As to this, there is this verse:

In whom the parts are set firm, like the spokes in the wheel's nave, him I know as the Spiritual Man to be known, therefore let not death perturb you.

To them he said:

Thus far know I this supreme Eternal; there is naught beyond.

Praising him, they said:

Thou art our father, who hast caused us to cross over to unwisdom's further shore. Obeisance to the supreme Seers! Obeisance to the supreme Seers!

Fully understood, the Spiritual Man concerning whom the question is put appears to be the Logos; the "sixteen parts" include, or represent, the seven worlds, the seven principles, and the activities of the principles in the worlds.

The essence of the answer is the return to the Logos, through the great Liberation; as the rivers which, rising as clouds, have come forth from the ocean, return once more to the ocean when their cycle is fulfilled, so, when their time is fulfilled, all beings return to the Logos, becoming that from which of old they came forth; becoming again the partless Immortal. C. J.

THE DIRECTION OF HUMAN EVOLUTION

THIS latest book[1] of a biologist of international reputation has been termed in scientific reviews the "religion" of the best science of the day. As such, students of Theosophy cannot but examine its conclusions and points of view with the greatest attention and hope. It may be stated at once that much encouraging progress can be found in its pages. The change in the viewpoint of science which has taken place in twenty-five years is great, and is certainly in the right direction. The reviewer knows of no other scientific book, from an equally authoritative source, which grants religion so important and necessary a rôle in human affairs. What is even more significant, religion is definitely given a dignified status, and is not portrayed as a concession to the weakness of the masses, incapable of a better and more rational basis for conducting their affairs. In general terms, the "religion" of present day science is markedly less materialistic than in a very recent past, which may well be a source of satisfaction.

But if the reader expects to find Professor Conklin's ideas on religion, evolution and democracy agreeing with Theosophy, he will be woefully disappointed as well as unreasonable. It is not too much to say that in no important particular will he agree with him. It can scarcely be expected that science in the lapse of one short century could even approximate the Ancient Wisdom. But when due allowance for this is made, it is still apparent that lack of reflection and study in some of the phases of his problems has led the author into absurd paradoxes, which any intelligent person, let alone a student of Theosophy, could grasp. Chief of these is his attitude towards science itself. In the preface he states that "the aim of real science, as well as of true religion, is to know the truth, confident that even unwelcome truth is better than cherished error, that the welfare of the human race depends upon the extension and diffusion of knowledge among men, and that truth alone can make us free." It would be hard to quarrel with this definition. But his conception of the methods and scope of science is so sharply limited that his aim becomes impossible of realization, as far as matters philosophical or religious are concerned, admittedly of fundamental importance to humanity. In fact we may go further, and state that if Professor Conklin had strictly eliminated all matters incapable of proof by scientific methods or outside the alleged scope of science, the book could not possibly have been written. Fortunately, students of Theosophy have a much better opinion of the scope of science, and consequently of its ultimate possibilities, which transcend the limits of the so-called material world. The book itself is, however, a convincing proof of how impossible it is for a scientist of any depth of nature to confine his thinking to those things

[1] Professor Edwin Grant Conklin, Sc.D., etc. (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1921.)

within the "scope" of the science of the day. Something will have to give, and unquestionably it will be the definition of the "scope." The modern science of psychology is driving an ever-deepening wedge into such prejudices, and on this count alone would have justified its existence, and entitled it to toleration for its many absurdities.

But this is somewhat of a digression, and we may better return to a more detailed analysis of the book, which is divided into three parts, "Paths and Possibilities of Human Evolution," "Evolution and Democracy," "Evolution and Religion," each with a considerable number of chapters.

The main viewpoint of the author is that the doctrine of evolution and its applications is of fundamental importance in human problems. In Part I, consequently, he presents a brief outline of evolution in general, the evolution of man, and the biological principles by which evolution is brought about, such as mutation, Mendelian inheritance, etc. With most of this, Theosophy is heartily in accord, but it must be noted that the modern scientific history of human evolution is purely the evolution of man's *physical* body, which unquestionably evolved from a lower animal type, approximately as indicated by scientific evidence. That the divine and spiritual elements of man, which Theosophy regards as the real man, ever evolved from an ape-like ancestor, utterly devoid of such elements, is a matter which science can never prove. It is only fair to say, however, that science has never tried. The divine and spiritual elements of man are not easily observable by scientific methods of research, and consequently either their existence is denied, or the whole question is put aside as not within the scope of science anyhow. It is, as already stated, however, the belief of the writer that this convenient method of disposing of embarrassing questions will become increasingly impossible, as more and more scientists find it increasingly impossible to be rigidly and consistently materialistic. Similarly the biological mechanism of evolution is acceptable only on the plane of physical matter.

Having shown the past history of evolution, and clearly sketched its grandeur, power and all-pervading quality, Professor Conklin examines the future in the light of the past. Man has evolved to the present point, he is still unquestionably evolving: to what is he evolving? This is very much the same question asked in a recent QUARTERLY, in the article "Evolution and Daily Living," and the preliminary answers are practically the same. In brief, our author shows with considerable clarity and force that physical evolution has virtually ceased, that eugenics can only theoretically raise the average level of physical excellence, that there is no evidence that a higher type of animal than Man can or will be evolved, and that the intellectual evolution of the individual has apparently ceased.

Professor Conklin's final answer is that "if the evolution of the human *individual* has come to an end, certainly the evolution of human *society* has not. In social evolution a new path of progress has been found, the end of which no one can foresee." It is pointed out that as one-celled organisms have progressed to many-celled, the small and simple to the larger and more complex,

so individuals have combined into families, tribes, nations and governments. In the past, he says, human culture has evolved through the stages of Savagery and Barbarism to Civilization. This last has been steadily increasing in complexity and extent, and is due to co-operative effort. Even the greatest discoveries were conditioned upon previously acquired knowledge. And while human society is full of disharmonies and less perfectly adapted to a particular environment than such social insects as ants and bees, the possession of intelligence, the capacity of learning by experience, and the steady annexation of the illimitable forces of nature, open up a path of progress the end of which no one can foresee.

There is much that is obviously sound in this view, as it is patent that human society is evolving and must evolve, just like anything else. That this is the ultimate goal of human evolution, however, any religious-minded person will doubt. Criticism is hardly fair at this point, as it is obvious that in Part I, the author is not going outside the limits of biological deduction. Philosophical and religious deductions are reserved for later parts, so we too shall reserve our comment at this time.

In Part II, "Evolution and Democracy," Professor Conklin steps outside of the strict field of biology, and attempts to apply the principles of evolution to democracy. After pointing out that society is fundamentally based on instincts rather than reason, that social progress means greater specialization and co-operation, that progress in human history is a long struggle between instincts and reason, individual freedom and social obligations, and many other obvious pairs of opposites, that "life and all of its activities consist in compromise, balance, adjustment between opposing principles," we are asked to study the biological bases of democracy.

Democracy is defined as a *system of social organization* which, "ideally at least, attempts to equalize the opportunities and responsibilities of individuals in society." It is important to bear this definition in mind, as the author more frequently employs the word in its usual connotation of a system of government, and it is sometimes difficult to determine just which kind of democracy he is talking about. At the outset it is quite evident that irrespective of *ideal* democracy, he has a very poor opinion of democracy as a *system of government*, as it is in practice to-day, and is well aware of many of its short-comings and defects. In this connection, two important points are made. First, attention is called to the extremely low average intelligence of the citizens of this republic. The recent army tests showed that nearly one half of the population will never develop mental capacity beyond the stage of a normal twelve-year-old child. It has always been recognized that the success of democracy depends upon the intelligence of the people, but it has always been assumed that education could promote intelligence. Professor Conklin's second point is that education is not the magical panacea so fondly supposed by advocates of democracy. Just as eugenics cannot possibly produce a higher physical type, so education "can only bring to development the qualities which are potentially present; it cannot increase these potentialities or capacities; and the attempt to

educate a person of D grade (mentally) beyond the fifth year of the elementary schools is usually wasted time." Finally, it is observed that mental capacity is inherited, that parents of low intelligence generally produce children of low intelligence, and more children than persons of high intelligence, that a constant influx of foreigners of low mental capacity has probably caused a decline in average intelligence, and that consequently "we are in a position to appreciate the very serious situation that confronts us as a nation."

Again Professor Conklin points out that the foundation principles of democracy are concisely summarized in the motto of France — "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." And yet nothing is more obvious than that nature has made men unequal in every respect. "What is the teaching of biology regarding these principles of democracy? . . . To put the question in a more practical form — How can we develop social organization in spite of individual liberty, democratic equality in spite of hereditary inequality, universal fraternity in spite of national and class antagonisms?" Three chapters are devoted to answering these questions.

These three chapters and the conclusion to Part II are unquestionably the poorest in the book. They are absurdly and patently illogical, they are both dogmatic and prejudiced. They can be unfavourably criticized on their contents alone, without recourse either to religion or to Theosophy. All the apparent defects and disadvantages of democracy (the present system of government), which no one brings out more forcefully or more tersely than Professor Conklin, are nevertheless dismissed by him as due either to false conceptions of democracy (kind not stated), or to faults inherent in human nature which democracy has not served to overcome! Thus he tells us that if social evolution is the next step forward in progress, biology shows clearly that individual liberty must be sacrificed to social organization. But while the usual conception of democratic freedom does involve the idea of maximum personal liberty, individualism, he would have us believe, is not a necessary part of democracy (presumably here regarded as an ideal system of social organization). This is a relic of "pioneer" idealism, and fortunately "we" are finding these ideals incompatible with the requirements of a populous country. "We still preserve the ancient formulas, but their content is changing and must continue to change as society develops." The present writer fears that this "we" is very wee in numbers. The speciousness of this argument, which fairly puts the cart before the horse, is evident. If it were fated for society to develop willy-nilly, of course personal freedom would *have* to swing into line, as it were, and allow itself to be subordinated. But we had rather understood Professor Conklin to prove quite clearly that this subordination of personal freedom was prerequisite to the development of society, that it would have to come *first*, if social progress were to be made. Somehow or other, if humanity should accept social evolution as the next step forward, and should sit down to await its arrival with the happiest anticipation, we doubt if social progress would ever put in an appearance. Again, lack of specialization is supposed to be a fatal defect of democracy. Instead of electing experts to office, we elect inexpert politicians. This

is a serious defect, but "lack of specialization is no essential part of democracy." Greatly relieved, we read that democracies develop specialists in all fields, just like any other form of government, and if in selecting men for public office, we still retain some more "pioneer" ideals, this phase is rapidly passing. So everything is all right here too, and it is the accidental omission of the proof and the stupidity of the reader which prevents the conquest of his pessimism! To show once more the lack of coherence, let us give the bare succession of the author's next statements. Lack of co-operation is even more evident, he says. Insistence on personal freedom and rights will wreck any system of social organization. Social co-operation is the greatest problem which confronts all types of government, and failure in this respect has caused the downfall of many civilizations in the past. The implication is that democracy wins over other forms of government, because these "very serious defects" are not the results of democracy, but of the character, education, and condition of the people!

The next chapter discusses democratic equality versus hereditary inequality; and Professor Conklin reminds us of a socialist soap-box orator. It is admitted at the outset that the usual creed of democracy is that all men are created equal, and that inequalities are due to environment, education, or opportunity. "And yet nothing is more evident than the inequalities of personality, intelligence, usefulness and influence; and the inequalities of heredity are greater even than those of environment." This would apparently support the claims of aristocracy. The fallacy of aristocracy, however, is that it confuses social and biological inheritance. The oldest son inherits his father's property, but he *may* not inherit his intelligence or character. A discussion of Mendelian inheritance follows. Its bearing on the problem is not obvious, but it may be accepted here, without justifying Professor Conklin's remarks. Mendel's great law unquestionably explains why a son may not inherit his father's intelligence and character, nor is there the slightest doubt that this happens. However, our author himself, in discussing the low average of intelligence, observed that parents of low intelligence generally produce offspring of low intelligence. It would seem, therefore, that parents of high intelligence would generally produce offspring of high intelligence, and this is not contrary to Mendelian inheritance. It is obvious, therefore, that Mendel's law is no more democratic than aristocratic. The other arguments are pure theory and pretty poor theory at that. The statement that most great leaders of mankind came from humble parents is historically inaccurate; that many of the greatest geniuses had a lowly origin is necessarily true, as the definition of the word involves such an origin in part. The citation of remarkable cases never proved any argument, and there is much to commend in the old saw — "the exception proves the rule." Part of one statement by Professor Conklin we heartily endorse. "No social system can afford to ignore the great personages that appear in obscure families, or to exalt non-entities to leadership because they belong to great families. In short, preferment and distinction should depend upon individual worth and not upon family name or position. This is ortho-

dox democratic doctrine, but not the faith or practice of aristocracy." The last sentence is an astonishing "rider" to an impeccable proposition, as it is patently absurd and contrary to history. Society is on an aristocratic basis in England, but the king is harmless if incompetent, the numerous lords who amount to nothing have no positions of authority or responsibility, and the present cabinet is entirely composed of men who had no title of nobility at birth, and the Prime Minister was the son of a coal miner. In fact there is no existing democratic government which has so consistently rewarded genius and ability, as has the aristocratic social system in England, and given it social equality as well by the system of creating titles. This may be fairly contrasted with the democratic organization of society in America, where a man of scientific eminence is recognized, but where his social position in New York would depend not only on his family connections, but also upon the amount of money he had. If it be argued that England is really democratic despite its aristocratic structure, even Germany could produce a Bismarck, and half the leading men of Japan to-day do not belong to the Samurai.

We can now take up again our author's statement that many of the greatest geniuses had a most lowly origin. We heartily agree, and note that of the six examples he cites, Shakespeare, Beethoven, Schubert, and Faraday developed their genius and obtained an undying reputation in an aristocratic régime. The statement, therefore, that it is the faith and practice of aristocracy to ignore "great personages that appear in obscure families," is easily shown to be a misapprehension of fact. To borrow a pet phrase of Professor Conklin's, his argument is based on emotion rather than reason, on sentiment rather than science. How absurd to suppose that great men of humble orgin arise in an aristocracy *in spite* of its alleged vicious fallacies, and then to hail the same event in a democracy as proof of the *alleged* blessings of that democracy. Until absolute proof of so improbable a proposition is produced, the open-minded man who is not biased by prejudice or emotion will suspend judgment, as far as the arguments in this chapter are concerned.

In the next chapter our author attacks the worship of distinguished ancestors as an important element in class antagonism versus universal fraternity. He brings out the point that our ancestors double in every generation, and that each of us would be descended from more than a billion if we went back a thousand years, and that the effort to discover a noble one and ignore the rest is often pure snobbery. Moreover it is biologically irrelevant. Inheritance is passed from one generation to another in the chromosomes of the germ cells. As there are forty-eight chromosomes, it is absolutely impossible for anyone to inherit chromosomes (or traits) from more than forty-eight contemporary ancestors. Consequently back of this point our ancestors, noble or obscure, are of no biological moment. The main point is, however, that due to the vast lapse of time, the number of generations, and the steady commingling of races and nations, we are all cousins if not brothers. Consequently not only are families not separate and individual entities, but nations and races are merely "minor units in the great organism of mankind." Man is a hopelessly mongrel

species, and the resemblances between all types of men are much greater than the differences.

Professor Conklin very naturally, therefore, deplores the racial, national, and class antagonisms, which have prevailed throughout the historical period, and which are a serious bar, in his opinion, to social evolution. He regrets that the international co-operation of the World War is being replaced by bigotry, prejudice and selfishness. The balance of the chapter is devoted more especially to class antagonism. It is in much the same vein as the preceding chapter, and calls for no special additional notice.

We are astonished, however, to read that the only possible cure for these sicknesses of society is the education of the people, so that they may "appreciate the difference between evidence and emotion, science and sentiment." In an earlier chapter Professor Conklin has shown quite clearly that education can no longer be regarded as "the magical panacea so fondly supposed." Moreover, even if the people did learn to appreciate these differences, we fear that considerable progress in morality and ethics would be necessary before they were lived up to.

The conclusion in the final chapter of Part II is, naturally enough, that democracy can save itself from the serious faults and dangers which threaten it. The author does not make this flat statement, but holds that no other system of social organization has so much promise of success. He admits that the rational processes of the people as a whole cannot be trusted, but "we can trust their social instincts and moral judgments," which are so deep-seated and widespread, as to form a firm foundation for democracy. There is no proof whatever for this incredible optimism, other than an extract from a speech by Mr. Woodrow Wilson!

We have gone into considerable detail in our exposition of Part II, in an effort to show that Professor Conklin's suggested remedies for the many evils and defects of democracy (as a present-day system of government) will not bear analysis, and that his elimination of other defects, in that they are no essential part of democracy (the ideal definition), is illogical and unjustifiable. To step outside his own grounds, however, for a word of general comment, we would suggest that social evolution must depend entirely upon moral and religious improvement, and that if this were the case, almost any social system could serve equally well.

Coming now to Part III, Evolution and Religion, we reach what is in many ways the most interesting section of the book. The author's premise is that the highest types of religion cultivate faith, hope, and love by appealing to the noblest emotions in human nature, the love of truth, beauty, and goodness, the mainsprings of human life. "This moral or emotional part of man's nature, as contrasted with his mind or intellect, is what is usually called the soul." The mysteries of the universe, the existence of evil, and the never ceasing conflict in every individual between right and wrong, these "fightings within and fears without" are relieved for the great mass of mankind only by religion, and its hold on the race is due to the fact "that it ministers in the highest sense

to human happiness," and consequently we shall never outgrow our need of it. There is much here that is pleasant reading coming from a scientist, although the definition of the soul is rather amusing, and the calling of religion an emotion might well annoy many, unless it be recalled that anything other than pure reason and intellection is termed an emotion in the scientific jargon of the day.

The remaining chapters, barring the final one, are particularly difficult to summarize adequately in a short space. They are a curious jumble of paradoxes, inconsistencies, prejudices, and misconceptions, mixed with much that is sound, much that is sensible and fair, and above all a latent spirit of reverence that alone explains the author's good opinion of religion by the time he gets through with its defects. Indeed, he seems to us at times to be a very Don Quixote tilting at windmills of the past or of his own imagining. Much of this is due obviously, to the fact that Professor Conklin has not followed the development of religious thought as studiously as biology, and his ideas are consequently derived from the more conspicuous and striking examples, which, alas — we must be fair in our turn — are too often deplorable or ridiculous.

Thus a careful distinction is drawn at the outset between theology and religion, which Theosophy has been most careful to make. This is the last we hear, however, of any such distinction, and most of the time, while berating religion, the author is obviously aiming at what an intelligent Episcopalian would consider the scattered remnants of a former narrow, dogmatic theology. While we must appreciate the restraint and courtesy with which Professor Conklin points out much glaring folly, it is positively insulting to any educated person, religiously inclined, to have such follies saddled on religion. Here it is, alas, true that the intellectual capers of Bryan in the name of religion are far more conspicuous than the reverse and quiet side of the picture. The old "Conflict between Religion and Science," is taken up about where Draper left off eighty years ago, and our author would undoubtedly be glad to discover that much theology has disappeared, to be replaced by some semblance of religion in this lapse of time. It is a waste of time to argue about the Creation and the authoritativeness of the Bible. The argument is superfluous for intelligent and educated people, and the followers of Bryan are probably hopeless and perhaps incapable of being convinced. But in this connection, however, we should like to quote our author on the province of science. "Science never penetrates as far as the ultimate origin and cause of anything, . . . but in the end leaves the last cause unexplained. Science maintains that . . . every event is due to pre-existing natural causes, and it assumes that this chain of cause and effect stretches back *ad infinitum*, though of course this cannot be proven. This chain may end in a first cause, an uncaused cause. But if so, we may be sure that science will never be able to discover it, for it lies beyond the reach of finite knowledge and experience."

We have already had occasion to regret the limitations that science has seen fit to enforce against itself. But in accepting them, we have the chief weapon

at hand for taxing science with dogmatism and prejudice. No clearer illustration of this could be found than in Professor Conklin's chapter on supernaturalism. He denies its existence. So does true religion or Theosophy. If a miracle be a temporary abrogation of natural law, we must disbelieve in miracles. If they be phenomena due to the operation of natural laws not as yet generally known, they are *at least* a theoretical possibility *until* all natural laws are known. Science is the first to admit that our knowledge of natural laws is in its infancy, and Professor Conklin very pertinently points out that much that is taken for granted to-day would have been deemed miraculous by our ancestors. We might add that what is emphatically stated to be impossible to-day, may in part at least be commonplace to-morrow. This is not a prophecy, nor is the argument to be taken as a proof of the genuineness of any particular miracle. Science is dogmatic when it says that a certain phenomenon which cannot be explained by known natural laws, is therefore a fake, and that people who believe in it are sunk in the mire of superstition. Such a position is not permissible until all natural laws are known. As a result, science has frequently incurred ridicule by announcing the discovery of something declared an absurd superstition by an earlier generation of scientists. The old alchemists were ridiculed for their attempts to transmute the baser metals into gold, but the transmutation of certain elements is now an established fact, and no chemist to-day would care to say that the changing of any particular element into any other was impossible.

If this position be regarded as a somewhat hypercritical one, there is a further aspect of the dogmatism of science which is indefensible, and that is that the matters which it chiefly denounces and holds forth against concern phenomena which are admittedly entirely outside the field of science as limited by scientists themselves. Thus Professor Conklin sneers at people who believe in ghosts, clairvoyance, spiritism, ouija-boards, reincarnations, etc., and "the few intellectual and scientific sponsors, who can always be found for any novel or sensational belief" — surely a strange collection of superstititions! Such a statement is a jumble of dogmatism, prejudice, ignorance and common sense; — of common sense, in that the advocates of these beliefs or phenomena are chiefly responsible for the disrepute in which they are held. When people are committed to asylums for referring their life problems to ouija-board wisdom, when people cheerfully pay five dollars to a professional medium for a ten-minute conversation with their great-grandfather, and when other utterly insignificant people freely admit that they are reincarnations of some famous historical personage, there is small wonder that sensible people are prejudiced against these things, and students of Theosophy would do well to bear this in mind, and guide their action and speech accordingly. There is ignorance, however, in referring to clairvoyance as a superstition, and to reincarnation as a novel and sensational belief. A lifetime spent in a biological laboratory is not the procedure to discover a genuine case of clairvoyance. Reincarnation is one of the oldest and grandest of philosophical conceptions, has comforted countless millions of people, and has enabled "thoughtful and sensitive per-

sons to face evil, fears, suffering, and death with hope and courage." Professor Conklin uses these words of praise for religion as a whole, and the true conception of reincarnation, not debased by modern folly or metempsychosis, is a religious doctrine.

Finally we would return once more to an earlier criticism. It is the writer's belief that there is not a shred of strictly scientific proof for reincarnation, using this term as the scientist uses it. Reincarnation cannot be a field for present-day scientific experimental research. On Professor Conklin's own definition, it is entirely outside the field of science, and for a scientist to say that it is gross superstition is pure dogmatism and prejudice. Why should our author give pronouncement on a matter entirely outside his field, to an audience part of which at least has given much more attention to the subject? How scornful he was, recently, when an *unintelligent* advocate of religion sneered at palæontology and evolution, making himself ridiculous by discussing matters beyond his competence. The *intelligent* student of religion is entirely reasonable in expecting Professor Conklin to set a better example.

Again he should learn that there are two classes of "superstitious" people, and make the proper distinction between them. While he is entirely correct in thinking that there are still people who believe that "natural laws may from time to time be set aside or abrogated and supernatural phenomena may be interposed," and while such people may properly be termed superstitious, there is another class which deserves more consideration. There are people, for instance, who are themselves clairvoyant, or who have seen a genuine case of clairvoyance in a member of their family. They have had no conscious control of this faculty, are quite unable to explain how it was done. Nevertheless, they are compelled to recognize it as a fact. But they are convinced that no natural law was abrogated, that no divine or miraculous agency exercised a supernatural power in their behalf, and hold firmly to the belief that the very science which so scornfully denies the genuineness of clairvoyance, will some day discover the natural law which makes the existence of that faculty possible. At least it is a degree of tolerance which might inspire some respect even in that scientist who has no reason in his personal experience to believe in any such "superstition," forgetting in his egotism that no specialist can know everything, or expect to observe a genuine case of every possible natural phenomenon, explained or unexplained.

It is not, however, the purpose of the writer to review so interesting and thought-stimulating a book by an opening paragraph of praise and pages of critical comment. To do so would be an injustice to author and reader alike. It is consequently a pleasure to turn to a brighter side of our picture, and we note with satisfaction that Professor Conklin does not believe in a mechanistic universe. He cannot accept a fortuitous combination of atoms, nor does he deem it possible that cosmic laws were the product of a happy accident. In other words, as a scientist, he holds that the available evidence seems to imply intelligent design or purpose back of the phenomena of biology, that evolution has revealed more clearly than ever before a larger teleology which includes

the lifeless as well as the living world. As Asa Gray, the great botanist, said: — "Design in the natural world is co-extensive with Providence." The religiously minded man has throughout the ages instinctively believed in Purpose back of all cosmic manifestation. It is gratifying, therefore, to find that science offers a definite intellectual background to an intuition which is an axiom of every great religion.

There is only one better chapter in the book, and that is the concluding one on the "Religion of Evolution." Here the native reverence of the author breaks through. His theme is unfolded, his case is submitted, and his sincere desire to harmonize true religion and true science is freed from much of the miscomprehension and superficiality of his earlier discussion, to which we felt compelled to call attention. To conclude now with a comment which we reserved in discussing Part I, we can only marvel that so eloquently expressed a belief in religion and its value, so reverent a conception of purpose in evolution, and the grandeur of its ultimate destiny, should not have appeared in the slightest to modify statements in the earlier Parts. We discover for the first time that social evolution is not the crassly economic and wholly material conception presented in Part I, where moral and ethical progress are casually mentioned as means to a more materialistic goal. We do not see why so much stress was laid on the attempt to prove democracy such a blessed medium of economic and political progress, when our author apparently glimpses a far higher destiny for mankind, more in accord with religion, in which view political economy would be of little importance in establishing the kingdom of God on earth.

But we can do no better in closing than to quote. "The religion of evolution deals with this world rather than the next. . . . It seeks to build here and now the 'City of God.' . . . It looks forward to unnumbered ages of human progress upon the earth, . . . to ages of greater justice and peace and altruism. Indeed the religion of evolution is nothing new, but is the old religion of the world's greatest leaders and teachers, . . . especially of Christ, which strives to develop a better and a nobler human race and to establish the kingdom of God on the earth."

"The inspiring visions of prophets and seers concerning a new heaven, a new earth, and a new humanity find confirmation and not destruction in human evolution viewed in retrospect and in prospect, for the past and present tendencies of evolution justify the highest hopes for the future and inspire faith in the final culmination of this great law in

"'— one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves.'"

BIOLOGIST.

AKHNATON THE "HERETIC" PHARAOH OF EGYPT

V

The New Kingdom (The Empire)

IN the last number of the Quarterly, mention was made of certain changes which had taken place during the XVIIIth Dynasty in the world of religious thought, and we must now run somewhat rapidly over the general position of religion just before the time of Akhnaton's coming to power.

Herodotus says: "The Egyptians were exceedingly God-fearing, more so than all other peoples," and this we feel to be entirely true of the earlier Egyptians, as it was true also of a later period. To the Egyptian, religion was life itself; he could not separate his life from some kind of religious activity. But there was a time during the Empire when the average Egyptian, led astray by the priests, looked to God no longer in the spirit of love and sacrifice, but with the hope of recompense, of material reward; when the popular attitude toward religion as an influence on life, was very different from what it had been formerly, — indeed it was only what we might expect as a result of the growing love of material splendour, the growing dependence on the wealth which poured in from the tributary provinces. The old-time simple piety was gone; the former earnest endeavour to obey unhesitatingly the will of God was now degraded into the equally earnest endeavour to distort God's will to fit the altered social conditions. In order more fully to appreciate the importance of these changes it will perhaps be wise to recapitulate somewhat, and to remind ourselves of a few points in the everyday faith of the Egyptian during the earlier periods.

We have seen how the Egyptian noble of the Old Kingdom to whom piety was a natural attitude of heart and mind, performed his religious duties side by side with his worldly obligations, and that even in the Middle Kingdom there was no very large number of professed priests, religious observances being discharged chiefly by laymen. Steindorff says: "The functions of religion were not yet the exclusive concern of a special priesthood, but were the common property of the whole people, . . . every person of rank, in addition to his secular calling, was invested with some religious office. These sacerdotal functions were often connected with the civil office of the man who performed them; judges, for example, were frequently also priests of Maat, the goddess of Justice, and the local princes were often at the same time the High Priests of the guardian gods who protected their respective districts."

Owing to lack of space it has been practically impossible to refer individually to any of these "guardian gods," these local deities of Egypt, but we must nevertheless realize that they had a most deep-rooted influence on the minds

and hearts of the people; that like the patron saints worshipped in certain cities to-day they were to be found from earliest times, thickly strewn over the "Two Lands." To the pious early Egyptian the god of his district was his father, the guardian of his home, who entered into every detail of his life, and who was therefore held in the deepest reverence. To quote again from Steindorff: "One room in an Egyptian house would contain a small chapel with an image or likeness of the god, where the family would offer prayer and sacrifice. Outside in the streets there would stand little shrines; in the fields there would be altars on which the husbandman would deposit his offerings. Ancient Egypt probably presented an aspect like that of a Catholic country in modern Europe, in which images of saints and chapels meet us at every step." To mention a few of the better known of these local gods[1] we might give the names of Ptah of Memphis, one of the most ancient and influential, Amen of Thebes, Sebek of the Fayûm, Khnum of the first cataract, Min of Coptos, etc. The local deity was very powerful in his own nome (or district), especially when he was associated with RA, and we have already drawn attention to a tendency which, as we noted at the time, meant the absorption of all minor gods into one supreme solar faith. Sayce, in referring to this fusion of the local gods with RA, says: "Though in one sense Amen (and other local gods) denoted the attributes of RA, in another sense they were distinct personalities with a distinct history behind them." This is an important point; the fusion was never absolute. It is sometimes very confusing to find a purely local god spoken of by the particular priesthood devoted to his worship as the "father of the gods," but we must not lose sight of the fact that except in the case of Amen he had no really *national* importance. We have already seen how Amen, originally the obscure local god of Thebes, rose to power owing to the growing importance of Thebes as a political centre; we have watched his increasing magnificence as a result of the splendid endowments which the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty bestowed upon his temples, particularly that of Karnak. But the crude fact remains that practically nothing is known of Amen before the time of the Middle Kingdom when, as already indicated, he first became prominent because of the rise of the local princes of his particular city, — Thebes. In the *Pyramid Texts* which are so full of allusions to both RA and Osiris, there is only one possible reference to Amen, and even this one reference is open to dispute. Of Amen's name, which means "hidden," very little is said by Egyptologists in general, for they can trace no connection between the god as he is known to us and the meaning of the name which he bears, and it might be quite reasonably maintained that if Amen is really the "hidden god" the absence of his name from the *Pyramid Texts* would be explained. We can only say in answer to this that so far as is yet known there is nothing to support the idea that there was anything exceptionally secret or concealed about Amen, though in a subject like Egyptology, where one day's "find" may

[1] Strictly speaking we might say that *all* "gods" had originally been "local," but some of them were of such vast antiquity, and represented within themselves such a universal aspect, that they had long since ceased to be confined to their original homes, and their worship had of necessity, and because of their universality, spread far and wide.

upset a well established theory of many years standing, it is always unsafe to be too dogmatic. At the time of which we write, however, Amen was most certainly *not* the "hidden god" either in theory or practice. Originally, so far as we can guess, he had probably been a fertility god, more particularly a god of the harvest, and therefore of the earth and not celestial, but his evident connection with Min, the very ancient and revered ithyphallic god of Koptos, whose tall plumes he always wore as insignia, would seem to indicate that he had also been a god of generation.[2] After his fusion with RA his old attributes partially faded, and he assumed many of the characteristics of the great Sun God, and was henceforth known largely, though by no means entirely, in his solar aspect. So much for Amen's origin, of which it has been truly said "we really know very little." With the march of political events which we have tried to outline, Amen's importance grew, and as the original source of his power had been political, so his position was assured as long as Thebes retained its supremacy, and Theban princes became Kings of Egypt. We have thus come to the period of the Empire when politically, and therefore exoterically speaking, Amen would seem to have completely eclipsed RA, for the priests of Amen had gained such power by their wealth and their authority in the state that outwardly at least their god became at this time the supreme god, and people in general, blinded by his magnificence, had begun to forget that his chief claim to sovereignty had originally been because of his fusion with RA. It is certain also that the priesthood of Amen did its utmost to wipe out from the memories of the people the obscure origin and very recent prominence of their god, — Karnak was attempting to dominate Heliopolis. But, it may be asked, was there at this period of history, any essential *difference* between RA and Amen, since Amen had so successfully usurped the place of RA, assuming many of his characteristics? To this we must in justice first answer that, speaking generally, our knowledge of "the gods" is largely the result of the light in which their various priesthoods represented them, in other words the conception of God is necessarily limited by the consciousness of His intermediaries, of those responsible for His presentation to the world. Speaking more particularly we may say that Amen, despite his position in the state, never took on the universal aspect which was so striking in RA, and though many of the characteristics of RA were attributed to Amen, these characteristics were *assumed* by the Theban god, and were not really *inherent*. To repeat what has just been quoted from Sayce, — the local gods "had a distinct history behind them," and this could never be completely obliterated. Amen, with all his splendour, when standing alone, never had a cosmic significance, and as time went on he more and more distinctly represented temporal power. This is shown in the fact that the priesthood of Amen held the highest administrative offices in the land at this time. We have already seen that the High Priest of Amen was frequently Grand Vizier as well as being the supreme

[2] It is sometimes claimed that Min (and therefore Amen) may have had a distant connection with the Sun, since the tall plumes would seem to ally them to Horus, one form of the Sun. This idea is, however, uncertain, and even flatly denied by some writers.

sacerdotal head, having been made superior to the much older High Priest of RA at Heliopolis. In studying Egyptian history and Egyptian religion, much knowledge is gained on many otherwise dark questions by considering the various titles belonging to one and the same individual, for the Egyptian loved titles, and men before the public eye usually had a long string of explanatory titles attached to their names. Thus we are able to draw distinct conclusions by comparing the titles belonging to the High Priest of RA at Heliopolis with those of the High Priest of Amen at Thebes. We remember that the High Priest of RA was reverently spoken of as "Great Seer" and "The Great One of Visions." He was also known as "He who sees the Secret of Heaven," and "Chief of the Secrets of Heaven." Place beside these some of the titles given the High Priest of Amen and we at once have a flood of light on the subject. He was known as "Great Superintendent of Works," and as such was responsible for all building operations connected with many of the temples; as "Prefect of the Treasury" he had control of the finances. He was "Prefect of the Prophets of the gods at Thebes" and "Prefect of the Prophets of all gods of the South and the North," the supreme sacerdotal head, as already noted. As "General of the Troops of God" he wielded great military power and it was to Amen that the Pharaohs of the XIIth and the XVIIIth Dynasties returned thanks for their military victories, for the help he gave them in building up their vast Empire. Amen gave earthly power, RA spiritual strength. Amen was the letter, RA the spirit of religion. We see therefore that the fusion of RA and Amen was not entirely an accomplished fact; that for all the theologizing of the priests, these two gods stayed more or less separate and distinct. Erman says that RA "is mentioned without hesitation in conjunction with Amen, as a *separate god*, and they are represented *side by side*." A good example of a conscious mental separation is to be found in the mighty oath, already quoted, taken by Thothmes III on his first great campaign: "Now as RA loves me, as my father Amen favours me,"—and many other instances could be given.

Practically nothing has been said in these pages of Osiris, since it is after all the history of the Sun God's influence which we have been trying to trace; but in studying, even superficially and from one point of view only (and there are so many!), the religion of Egypt, we are met at every turn by Unnefer, "The Good Being" (one of the names by which Osiris was known), who seems to hold out his hands to us with indescribable sweetness and tenderness, and though it is not at present possible even to outline the influence of Osiris on the lives of the people, the subject being so wide and far-reaching, we cannot ignore him altogether, — nor do we wish to do so, for it is largely when we *compare* the religious functions of RA and Osiris that we realize the immensity of the Sun God's power. Broadly speaking Egyptian religion is the history of but two dominant forces, — RA (with Amen later arbitrarily attached), and Osiris, many of the local deities being incorporated in one or the other of these two cycles. The Osirian faith had been gaining steadily in strength since the time of the Middle Kingdom, and though we have seen that there was much

interweaving from earliest times of the cults of the two great gods, outwardly at least they remained sufficiently different to avoid serious confusion, — as already stated, RA belonged to the Throne, Osiris more to the people; RA was the state religion, Osiris the popular faith. Inwardly their cults ran to a certain extent side by side, merging and separating and again merging, and the case might be stated roughly thus and then dismissed for the present. Osiris, as the Judge of the Dead[3], inevitably led men's minds to the life *after* death. RA, as the champion of the living, exacted purity and righteousness *here* and *now*. In the funeral papyrus of Yuaa is a version of one of the chapters of the *Book of the Dead*, and in it we find this sentence: — "Yesterday is Osiris, and to-morrow is RA." As an interpretation of this we should read, — yesterday is past, our deeds of yesterday are written down against us, and Osiris must judge us by our deeds. But hope is not dead, RA meets us on the threshold of to-morrow, helping us to struggle on, showing us how we may blot out the wrong deeds of yesterday and fill their places with the right deeds of to-day. One would expect that these two points of view would be wholly compatible, in fact that one would quite naturally lead to the other, and so indeed it largely was during the Middle Kingdom, and probably would have so continued during the Empire, had it not been for the infamy of the priests of Amen, who, by their treachery, by their deliberate misuse of the power originally given them, had now made the very name of Amen an offence. For had the Amen priesthood been content with a reasonable amount of temporal and administrative power, comparatively little harm would have resulted; but when, hoping to increase its own worldly influence, it endeavoured to humble the other priesthoods (noticeably that of RA) by appointing as their High Priests members selected from the collegiate body at Thebes; when, in order to gain complete ascendency over the minds of an innately religious people such as the Egyptians, it tried to monopolize the spiritual leadership, which had from of old belonged to RA; when the priests of Amen began to tamper with the oldest and holiest religious traditions of most ancient Egypt, traditions long since sacred to the great Sun God, — it was then that the Black Forces broke loose and flooded the "Two Lands." But behind the dark cloud of corruption created by the Amen priesthood, still visible to the few who had the eyes to pierce its blackness, flamed the undimmed glory of RA. Thus when the Theban god is spoken of as "almighty," it is generally in the capacity of RA rather than of Amen. When Thothmes III says: — "I have done this for my father Amen, because he knoweth heaven, and he knoweth earth, he seeth the whole earth hourly," Amen is here referred to in his solar aspect. Hatshepsut, in speaking of the Hyksos two generations after they had been expelled, scoffed at them as ruling "in ignorance of RA."

There is a celebrated "legend" told about Thothmes IV, which is found in the inscription on the huge red granite tablet standing between the forepaws of

[3] The reader will of course realize that we are referring to one aspect only of Osiris, — the purely moral aspect There is, however, a vast field of Osirian influence outside his rôle as Judge of the Dead, — we mean Osiris as the god of Resurrection, of Fertility and therefore of Vegetation; also of the Nile; sometimes of the Moon.

the Great Sphinx. The actual date of the Sphinx stela is in some dispute, and it is largely thought to be, as it stands to-day, a late restoration of the original monument erected by Thothmes IV to commemorate the wonderful experience which came to him there. However this may be, the story on it runs that Thothmes, while still a young prince, and probably eager to escape from the confining life at court, "did a thing which gave him pleasure, upon the highlands of the Memphite nome . . . together with two of his followers, while not a soul knew of it." That is, he went on a hunting expedition into the desert, and after "hunting lions and wild goats, coursing in his chariot, his horses being swifter than the wind," he became very tired, and crept into the deep, calm shadow of the Great Sphinx,[4] and fell into a profound slumber, during which he had his amazing vision. It was the Sun God, none other, who appeared to him, telling him to clear away the sand which was drifting in resistless waves over the sacred monument, and promising him that he should become the Pharaoh. To quote further from the stela itself: — "One of those days (one of the days occupied by the hunting expedition), it came to pass that the King's son, Thutmose, came coursing at the time of midday, and he rested in the shadow of this great god (the Sphinx). A vision of sleep seized him at the hour when the sun was in the zenith, and he found the majesty of this revered god speaking with his own mouth, as a father speaks to his son, saying: 'Behold thou me! See thou me! my son Thutmose. I am thy father, Harmarkhis-Khepri-Ra-Atum (*i.e.* RA-Horakhti), who will give thee thy kingdom on earth, at the head of the living. Thou shalt wear the white crown and the red crown[5] upon the throne of Keb, the hereditary prince. The land shall be thine in its length and breadth; that which the eye of the All-Lord shines upon. The food of the Two Lands shall be thine, the great tribute of all countries, the duration of a long period of years. My face is thine, my desire is toward thee. Thou shalt be to me a protector, for my manner is as I were ailing in all my limbs. . . . The sand of this desert upon which I am, has reached me; turn to me, to have that done which I have desired, knowing that thou art my son, my protector; come hither, behold I am with thee, I am thy leader.' When he had finished this speech, the King's son awoke, hearing this . . . he understood the words of this god, and he kept silent in his heart. . . . "[6] So we see that RA still had the power to command, the power to give. So also was it RA, rather than Amen, to whom men turned in this life for ethical guidance; it was always RA who demanded purity of action, development of character. Amen, as a *moral* influence, never supplanted RA.

Turning now to the mortuary texts of the Empire, we find in many of the tomb inscriptions such a marked increase of that democratic tendency already observable in the Middle Kingdom, that we have frequent and clear-cut

---

[4] Traditionally the Sphinx had been in existence since before the time of Khafra, IVth Dynasty, and it was dedicated to RA-Horakhti.

[5] The high white crown of the South, and the low red crown of the North, more familiar to us in their united form than any other crown worn by the Kings of Egypt.

[6] From *Ancient Records*.

glimpses into individual character, conjuring up the most touching and living pictures of the personal loss, through death, of the private individual. With profound sympathy we are thus able to share the overwhelming grief of the wife for her dead husband as the tomb chamber is sealed up, shutting him away from her. Turning mournfully away, to take up the burden of her lonely life, she cries: "I am verily thy sister, thou great one, do not forsake me. . . . Why is it that thou art far from me, thou who didst love to jest with me. Thou art silent and dost not speak."

During the Empire we also begin to find the *heart* playing an important rôle, and it is frequently referred to in tomb inscriptions. When untampered with by the priests of Amen, there is great beauty and a deep significance in its use. Thus we read: "It was my heart that caused that I should do them (the services of the deceased for the King), by its guidance of my affairs. It was . . . as an excellent witness. I did not disregard its speech, I feared to transgress its guidance." Elsewhere we see the loving wishes of the family of Paheri, a recently dead prince of El Kab: "Mayest thou go in and out with a glad heart, . . . thou hast thine upright heart in thy possession, and thy earlier heart[7] belongs to thee. . . . Mayest thou spend eternity in gladness of heart, in the favour of the god that is in thee." Also elsewhere we find: "The heart of a man is his own god." We see here a clear and vivid consciousness of the Higher Self, that Higher Self in each man on whom RA ceaselessly calls.

Leaving the tomb inscriptions, we turn at last to the *Book of the Dead*, as preserved to us in the mortuary papyri of this period. We have already seen that the title, *Book of the Dead* is a modern one, and that during the Middle Kingdom no systematic compilation of mortuary texts had yet begun to be made. Even in the Empire there was no such *book*, and by that we mean no fixed, no canonical selection. Up to a comparatively late period this grouping of texts was in a purely amorphous state and did not really crystallize into definite, unaltered form until Ptolemaic times. The "chapters" used in each particular case were purely matters of choice, and though there were distinctly favourite chapters, which we notice because of their more frequent use, the choice was, in fact, left entirely to preference. As already stated, one is inclined at first to feel that the *Book of the Dead* is chiefly a vast collection of magical formulæ, so overlaid with charms are the ancient religious beliefs. These beliefs, however, form a solid and indestructible basis, to anyone looking below the surface, — indestructible because composed of those moral and religious ideals which are nearest to the heart of man. The substance of this basis is man's moral responsibility for his own acts, the sincerity of his relations with God. Such beliefs, as we know, can be traced all the way back to earliest times. The great and solemn scene in the Judgment Hall (of which there are several versions during the Empire, but all of which resemble each other), leaves on us a profound impression of the deeply ingrained moral consciousness of the Egyptian. He hears the quiet, but insistent voice of his Higher Self;

[7] This "earlier heart" may refer to the sum-total of those *faculties* which, after a sojourn in Devachan, we bring back with us into incarnation, as the fruits of the mental and moral experiences in a former life.

he recognizes that obedience to this Self is his sure and only means of attainment; he must bring a clean conscience into the presence of his awful judges if he hopes to be accepted by them and dwell in the happy world of the hereafter. All would have been well had not the priests of Amen stepped in and poisoned, almost at its very source, the clear crystal spring of religious sincerity. We have seen that the increasing riches of the temples, owing to the magnificent endowments which the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty had made to Amen, had resulted in the need of a special sacerdotal organization, and that the priesthood had, in consequence, become a definite profession. We now see how, in the hands of this priesthood, the old standard of personal accountability was perverted into one of availability, for the Egyptian's mind was given over so largely to speculation on and preparation for the life hereafter that it gave the priesthood an even better opportunity than it might otherwise have had for working on the fears and doubts of the people. This opportunity they found in the magical charms which had formed so large a portion of the mortuary texts of both the Old and the Middle Kingdoms. While a belief in the power of the right word spoken at the right moment had always been firm and deep-rooted, the incantation until now had been used chiefly as a protection against supernatural dangers, and it was held that even a charm of the greatest potency could not save the guilty soul from a just punishment. The priests of Amen, however, recognized in the charms an opening for personal gain, and they were not slow in seizing it. Toward the middle of the XVIIIth Dynasty we begin to see the charm used no longer as a legitimate *safeguard*, but, instead, as a *mask*, as a protection against the just results of evil-doing; — that is to say, magic, with official recognition and approval, had invaded the realm of morals, a perversion entirely due to the utterly unprincipled priesthood. If the charm were powerful enough it would wrap the deceased in a kind of veil so that when he stood before the great Tribunal of Justice his guilt would not be perceived. The immense wealth of the XVIIIth Dynasty had brought with it an almost inevitable laxity in social ideals, so that the need of these charms grew in proportion, especially as the priests never ceased to fan the embers of apprehension. Indeed the necessity for mere *numbers* was so great that there was no longer sufficient space for them to be written inside the coffin, as in the Middle Kingdom. The priests, therefore, introduced the use of papyri of varying lengths and richness, some very sumptuous, some more humble, with an eye to suiting the purses of the various classes. All were closely written over with magical formulæ for every possible need of the deceased, and to fit every imaginable situation. These mortuary papyri, most beautifully illustrated with delicately outlined and coloured vignettes, reaching sometimes a length of eighty or more feet and containing over one hundred and twenty-five chapters, were increasingly felt to be so necessary a part of the funerary equipment that the priests had them executed by scribes in enormous quantities ready for use, with the place for the name of the deceased left vacant, so that it could be filled in at will, and for any person whatever at a moment's notice. Anyone rich enough could purchase his own salvation or that of a

relative, by paying the price demanded by the priests of Amen, who, in return for "cash down," would write the desired name in the blank space, and everybody would be satisfied! Naville caustically remarks: "The copying of papyri of the *Book of the Dead* must have been a profitable industry in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty." As all these rolls not only presupposed but actually guaranteed the complete success of the candidate before his judges, owing to the potency of the words used (words which had such power to throw dust in the eyes of the Lords of the Netherworld as to blind them to the moral standing of the deceased), we can see to what a degraded use these magical charms had been brought. We have already seen that the heart was used in tomb inscriptions with great beauty and evident purity of purpose, but unfortunately it was also used in the charms of the mortuary papyri, prepared under the supervision of the priests of Amen, with dishonest motives which are quite as evident. There is a whole section of the *Book of the Dead* entitled, "Chapter of preventing that the Heart of a man oppose him in the Netherworld," and both Breasted and Erman lay great stress on the fact that during the Empire this chapter was used as a false scent. When the guilty soul, standing before his judges, knew that the moment for exposure had come, he spoke entreatingly, threateningly, to his own heart thus: "O my heart that came from my mother! O my heart belonging to my being! Rise not up against me as witness, oppose me not in the council. Be not hostile to me before the master of the balances." (The heart of the deceased, as we know, was always weighed in the balance against the feather of Maat, or Truth.) The magical force of these words was so effective that the soul, no matter what his guilt, was allowed to pass on as one "without sin." Compare for a moment the use of the heart, as shown in this chapter, promiscuously resorted to, with its use in the tomb inscriptions, quoted above, and we see only too clearly the different motives, the totally different aims. In the tomb inscriptions the heart is the best, the safest guide for a man's actions; it leads him always to the fulfilling of his duty; obedience to its call brings joy and peace. In the papyri, executed by the priests of Amen, the heart can be safely appealed to as a false witness, a teller of lies; it is, in short, a sure cloak of iniquity.

Beside the papyri the priests offered other aids for the success of the deceased. Notable among these is the heart scarab, which was usually carved in some very hard stone, and which was engraved with the all-powerful words taken from the chapter just quoted: "O my heart, rise not up against me as witness." This amulet was laid on the breast of the mummy, inside the wrappings, and had such power that no matter how deeply immersed in sin a man might have been during life, the charm would effectively silence the accusing voice of his own conscience, so that his judges would not perceive his guilt. Wiedemann, in writing on the subject of these scarabs, shows plainly the reason for this strong appeal to the heart, — "that it may not give evidence against him in the Hall of Judgment, but may take his part at the momentous weighing scene. For the heart, as he (the Egyptian) emphatically asserts, is a *distinct personality within him*." Erman says: "The principal intention . . . was to enable a

man to escape his future destiny. . . . An attempt was made to get rid of that inconvenient witness" (the heart); while, according to Breasted: "The invention of these devices by the priests was undoubtedly as subversive of moral progress and the elevation of the popular religion, as the sale of indulgences in Luther's time." Lastly, we should like to point out what seems to us a very significant fact, and one not sufficiently noted, — that this amulet, being in the form of the scarabaeus, which was not only the emblem of resurrection (hence its choice as a mortuary charm), but which was also, as we know, a symbol of the all-powerful Sun God, would seem to fulfil a double purpose here, in that when the deceased, wearing this symbol, appeared before Osiris, he would give the impression of being actually under the protection of RA, and would thus be considered as above suspicion.

Without going more deeply into the subject, therefore, we can yet see how magic had become an agent for immoral ends, deliberately started by the priesthood of Amen, with a view to personal gain, and as deliberately encouraged. We see how subtly the priests counteracted the influence for good which RA shed abroad in this life, and, making a dupe of Osiris in the life hereafter, deprived him of his power to judge impartially. The old ethical standard of "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," a standard which for thousands of years had been the keystone of religion to the Egyptian, was now, by the ingenuity of a corrupt and mercenary priesthood, largely neutralized and very nearly destroyed altogether.

HETEP EN NETER.

(To be continued)

Is it not true that God Himself, as the creative spirit of the universe, is to be thought of in these terms, — namely, as an Eternal Renewer of evolution? Is not His function the utilization of self-activity for the perpetual re-creating of endless spirals leading up to self-conscious beings who have the power to conceive the whole scheme, and to make perpetually, in their turn, an ever renewed search for higher forms of self-expression? — JAMES JACKSON PUTNAM, M.D.

Said the ant to the ant: — Humans are strange. Twenty-five million years learning to say 'No'; five million years congratulating himself on the achievement; fifty million years discovering that nothing need ever have been said but 'Yes.'

—ANON.

WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

"The inventions of man differ wholly from the dealings of God. In His designs there is no haste, no rest, no weariness, no discontinuity; all things are done by Him in the majesty of silence, and they are seen under a light that shineth quietly in the darkness, showing all things in the slow history of their ripening." (Farrar: *The Life of Christ.*)

THE story of my joining the Theosophical Society is very simple, almost commonplace, viewed from an external standpoint. It was led up to by a perfectly natural progression of events. Yet, when one looks at it more closely, and has perhaps gained a very little understanding, the marvellous guidance of the Master's Hand is discernible throughout.

It has been my experience, and judging from a very limited standpoint at best, I think it has been the experience of others who join the Theosophical Society, that because we have allied ourselves with a Society which not only approves, but teaches Occultism, we expect miracles to take place, and our lives to undergo some mysterious change or transformation. Then as time passes, and our duties do not change, but on the contrary become more intricate, more burdensome, we are disappointed. We have looked at the matter from the wrong standpoint. The fact is that miracles do take place. Many must already have taken place to have made it possible for us to become members of the Theosophical Society. But these miracles were so real, they went so deep, — they were truly occult — that they wove themselves into the apparently natural course of our lives. So real were they, in fact, that the transformation of events which they effected was not discernible to a casual observer.

In the very early days of my membership, when I was contemplating some rather drastic decision which would have entailed worry and even pain to others, an old and very wise student of Theosophy said to me: "Give the Master a chance;" and then went on to explain that the Master, whenever possible, works through natural ways and by natural means, and that it was quite likely that my problem might solve itself very simply; at least I could give the Master a year in which to solve it in His way, before intervening and upsetting things generally. Within five months events had so shaped themselves, so simply and quietly, that my problem solved itself, and I was practically forced into the step which a few months before would have been so very drastic. Was this a miracle? It is because, among other reasons, this fact has been brought home to me very forcibly in my own "simple and uneventful story," that I should like, if I am able, to write it down, in the hope that some other might have his attention arrested, and discover in the natural flow of his own life, the marvellous working of that Guiding Hand.

Perhaps loneliness and depression, on the one hand, and a frantic search for excitement, on the other, — two ends of the same stick — are the key-notes of

my childhood and younger days. It was a search which drove me, a victim of self, first into one state and then another, only to find myself in a veritable maze. The Law of Correspondences teaches us to look for the same experience on all planes. Truly here we can catch a glimmer of the Hall of Learning; "in it thy Soul will find the blossom of life, but under every flower a serpent coiled." Religion always had an appeal for me, and when I was but twelve years old I began to become interested in church work and to teach in Sunday School. Those poor little victims whose karma it was to come under my tutelage! Was not I myself in the sorest need of being taught "Sunday School"? The pity of it, that when young people seriously try to seek comfort and help in the present day religious institutions, the real needs of their souls are so pathetically neglected, and they finally drift away more hungry than when they first made their appeal! It is, perhaps, fortunate that we cannot in our present state of evolution remember too much of our early life. And then people wonder why, if reincarnation is a fact, we cannot remember our past lives! In most cases it might be more than the soul could bear. Again it is the Good Law that protects us at this point as at all others. Looking back now, it is easy to see the Master's guidance throughout my early life. Yes, His guidance, and the protection of His guardian angels. (I am sorry, I am afraid I kept them very busy.) The "Hound of Heaven" was chasing me, and by means of these experiences, the Master was slowly and carefully drawing me to the centre of life where I could in all completeness find Him. And what was the outward road which took me there? A few casual remarks dropped during an informal lecture. There were perhaps twelve of us in attendance. We all heard the same remarks, but it was as if the Master were holding the ears of my heart open, so that immediately after the lecture I inquired where I could hear more of that teaching. The address was given me, and the next service found me there. Immediately I knew what I had been seeking — the Master — and that there He was to be found. We were told that even we, as we are, could become His disciples. More, that He had need of us; in fact, that His Sacred Heart could never be at peace until we had united ourselves to Him. Need of us! It is almost humourous, and yet we must remember that "even New York City refuse is picked over and much of value is found in it before the balance is burned and buried." That settled it for me. Until this day I do not think I have voluntarily missed a service in that holy place.

In time I learned that the leaders there were all members of the Theosophical Society, and I was invited to attend one of its meetings. Even then I had sense enough to want to go where "they" were. So I went, and then to another. It all seemed perfectly natural. The discussions I heard were so explanatory of life and its problems. The twin doctrines of karma and reincarnation especially appealed to me. They unravelled many inexplicable tangles. Justice ruled the Universe, truly, but a justice which springs from a burning Heart. Not the justice of a "jealous God," with His stern avenging angel, but "poetic justice," in which the alchemy of the Master's love influences the balance

sheet more than aught else. After a few months the Theosophical Convention took place, and I attended the public lecture on Sunday afternoon. That lecture was the actual external cause of my immediately joining the Society. We were told that the ideal of womanhood was "the beauty of holiness and the loveliness of all lovely things." Of course it was; I seemed to recognize it immediately, although it seemed as though I had been spending most of my time developing myself in exactly the opposite direction.

Why did I join the Theosophical Society? Why do any of us join the Theosophical Society? Because it is the next step in our evolution; because it is written in the Book of Life; because the Master's grace and love for us have in some miraculous way enabled us to accumulate sufficient merit to be given this marvellous opportunity. In short, because we have to; and I venture to suggest that until that time comes we were far wiser not to take the step.

The dictionary explains the word "miracle" as "a wonderful thing." Is it not conceivable that what to our holden eyes in this physical world would be "a wonderful thing," might be the natural law and order of the spiritual world? Is not this spiritual world right here, surrounding and enveloping us so wholly that we do not even discover it? In joining the Theosophical Society we open, as it were, a doorway into the spiritual world. We open ourselves to its influences and forces. Naturally we expect miracles to take place. Have we not just decided that they are of the very nature of the spiritual world? "O ye of little faith!" "Eyes have they, but they see not; they have ears, but they hear not." Daily, hourly, with infinite compassion and age-long patience, He is directing our life with minutest care, and because we seek Him without, we miss the magic encounter within. I wonder how many of us there are who can honestly look back over their years of membership and not discover a veritable succession of miracles. For myself, I can only say that as they can be discovered as the stepping-stones leading me into the Theosophical Society, so since my membership they have been multiplied a thousand-fold. Insurmountable barriers have fairly dissolved into dust, so that I find myself in surroundings the very key-note of which is service of the Masters. In the miracle of the loaves and the fishes, a boy gave the Master all he had — a paltry few loaves and fishes. How foolish it must have seemed, with five thousand hungry people to be fed! Cannot we give Him all we have; only a little faith, if no more? He will do the rest. But it must be a living faith; the kind *Light on the Path* speaks of when it says: "The truth is that faith is a great engine, an enormous power, which in fact can accomplish all things. For it is the covenant or engagement between man's divine part and his lesser self." We are told: "We hear that to which we listen; that to which our attention is directed we perceive." Exactly, and even more. In giving Him our faith, our thought and attention, we untie His Hands; we make it possible for Him to do more and more. Gradually the veils begin to fall, and the fog in which we have enveloped ourselves begins to lift. Now we are learning occultism. We are having real experience. Our consciousness is unfolding, and we are gaining knowledge, — the only way knowledge is ever gained, through personal

experience. Yes, we must expect miracles to happen; we must seek them in our lives with an undaunted faith in the "magic" of the spiritual world.

Is it not within our power to make it the greatest miracle of all to become a member in the Theosophical Society? Through that doorway we can reach up to the very Lodge itself — that great Lodge of Masters, our Elder Brothers — those who have gone before. And what is the almost unbelievable message they are sending back to us to-day, to you and to me, to each one of us, members in their Society, partakers perhaps in some small measure of their light and understanding? It has been transcribed for us, and voiced to us by one of their household: "In God's name come over and help us. The need is so great!"

M. E.

Thou who dost blame injustice in mankind,
'Tis but the image of thine own dark mind;
In them reflected clear thy nature is
With all its angles and obliquities.

—Jalaluddin Rumi.

The work of man in this world is to polish his soul from the rust of concupiscence and self-love, till, like a clear mirror, it reflects God. . . .

"If thou takest offence at every rub,
How wilt thou become a polished mirror?"

—Jalaluddin Rumi.

. . . Hearts long years impassive and opaque,
Whom terror could not crush nor sorrow break,
Yielding at last to love's refining ray,
Transforming and transmuting, day by day,
From dull grown clear, from earthly grown divine,
Flash back to God the light that made them shine.

—Jalaluddin Rumi.

NIRVÂNA

NIRVÂNA is a Sanskrit word, compounded of *nis*, out, and *vâna*, blowing; therefore "blowing out," as of a light, or "extinction," is the dictionary meaning, the literal equivalent in English. The *Century* further defines the term: "In *Buddhism*, the condition of a Buddha; the state to which the Buddhist saint is to aspire as the highest aim and highest good. Originally, doubtless, this was extinction of existence, Buddha's attempt being to show the way of escape from the miseries inseparably attached to life, and especially to life everlastingly renewed by transmigration, as held in India."

This, only slightly modified by later orientalists, still represents the popular conception of Nirvâna. Nirvâna means extinction, nevertheless it is upheld as the goal, that state to the attainment of which all mankind as well as the disciple should strive, and for which the latter should long. However unpractical to Western minds, the age-old wisdom of the disillusioned Easterner sees, it is maintained, only release and liberation in such a surcease from individual existence.

"I take my refuge in Thy Law of Good!
I take my refuge in Thy Order! *OM!*
The dew is on the Lotus! — rise Great Sun!
And lift my leaf and mix me with the wave.
Om mani padme hum, the Sunrise comes!
The Dewdrop slips into the shining Sea!"

"The dewdrop slips into the shining sea" — and loses its identity as a drop. As *The Voice of the Silence* says: "Where is thy individuality, Lanoo, where the Lanoo himself? It is the spark lost in the fire, the drop within the ocean, the ever-present ray becomes the All and the eternal radiance."

Here then is a difficulty familiar to students of Theosophy, and one which Edwin Arnold himself faced, for in the preface to his beautiful *Light of Asia* he writes of Nirvâna that he has "a firm conviction that a third of mankind would never have been brought to believe in blank abstractions, or in Nothingness as the issue and crown of Being." He therefore, in the sixth book, thus defines Nirvâna:

"Thus 'finishing the Path'; free from Earth's cheats;
Released from all the skandhas of the flesh;
Broken from ties — from Upâdânas — saved
From whirling on the wheel; aroused and sane
As is a man wakened from hateful dreams.
Until — greater than Kings, than Gods more glad! —
The aching craze to live ends, and life glides —
Lifeless — to nameless quiet, nameless joy,
Blessed NIRVÂNA, — sinless, stirless rest —
That change which never changes!"

To the Western mind, reading casually as it usually does, these terms "lifeless," "nameless quiet," "sinless, stirless rest," suggest, at the most, individuality of the vaguest and mistiest kind, because supposedly *something* rests, *something* joys. But who or what it is that, though "lifeless," is aware of "rest" is so indefinite as to be practically incomprehensible, and certainly unsatisfying. Even when Rhys Davids writes that, "*Nirvâna* is therefore the same thing as a sinless, calm state of mind; and, if translated at all, may best, perhaps, be rendered holiness — holiness, that is, in the Buddhist sense, perfect peace, goodness, and wisdom" — his terms do not seem to elucidate the conception. Rather do they becloud the issue. If a "state of mind," why "extinction" at all; and are not "perfect peace, goodness, and wisdom" merely abstractions, which, though suggesting concepts familiar to the Christian reader, yet explain nothing because vague generalizations?

Further than this, Nirvâna is not only in many places in theosophic literature held before the disciple as his goal; but, this idea having become familiar, we find suddenly that just at the point where Nirvâna, so long sought, is about to be attained, the exalted Lanoo is exhorted to make "the great Renunciation," to forego Nirvâna, which in strict justice he has earned, and to seek a path of even higher reach.

A fundamental reconciliation must, in the nature of things, underlie these apparent contradictions, if the principle may only be grasped. It will be easier to examine each conception separately, taking them in order.

I

At certain stages of the path, Nirvâna is set before the aspirant as his goal. Buddha himself was pre-eminently

> ". . . the saviour of the world,
> The teacher of *Nirvâna* and the Law."

If so, extinction of existence must be a false understanding of the word, else spiritual reality would itself be a negation. A goal, and a desirable one, it certainly must be. The *Voice*, which towards the close presents Nirvâna from a totally new view-point, as suggested above, says that: "Not one recruit can ever be refused the right to enter on the Path that leads towards the field of Battle. For either he shall win, or he shall fall. Yea, if he conquers, Nirvâna shall be his . . . in him will men a great and holy Buddha honour." Nirvâna is the end in store, with no less attainment than that of Buddhaship. Again it says: "But if thou would'st Nirvâna reach, . . . let not the fruit of action and inaction be thy motive, O thou of dauntless heart." In Buddhist writings the way to Nirvâna is the way of peace. Nirvâna is Liberation, the "Treasure," comparable with the true "Sabbath" of the mystical Hebrew scriptures, or the Shekinah, and the "Promised Land." That "Treasure," and the Path to it of the *Voice*, have been beautifully set forth by Arnold:

"Then the King amazed
Inquired, 'What treasure?' and the Teacher [Buddha] took
Meekly the royal palm, and while they paced
Through worshipping streets — the Princess and the King
On either side — he told the things which make
For peace and pureness, those Four noble Truths
Which hold all wisdom as shores shut the seas,
Those eight right Rules whereby who will may walk —
Monarch or slave — upon the perfect Path
That hath its Stages Four and Precepts Eight,
Whereby who so will live — mighty or mean,
Wise or unlearned, man, woman, young or old —
All soon or late break from the wheels of life
Attaining blest Nirvâna."

Nirvâna being, therefore, a prize to be sought (even if not the ultimate prize) and the Nirvânic state having been traditionally attained by the Buddha, what is it, and how reconcile the manifest paradox? Where lies the misunderstanding by Western minds of the Eastern use of such synonyms as "annihilation" or "extinction," and what is the truth which we are to seek in the various teachings about Nirvâna?

Madame Blavatsky has much to say on this subject, — indeed, the prominence which she gives to the misunderstandings of Nirvâna, and her repeated expositions of its true significance do not seem as yet to have borne sufficient fruit, nor to have enlarged the understanding of students generally.

The primary difficulty resolves itself into a philosophical problem, — into a choice of terms. If you take your stand with the world of manifestation, then *absolute*, *pure spirit*, unconscious and unmanifest, becomes virtually no-*thing*, or nothing. On the other hand, philosophically speaking, if you take as your reality pure spirit, then all manifestation becomes a *maya*, an illusion, to be escaped, crucified, or risen from. Buddha for the most part was addressing men of the world, and therefore used their terms, and entered into their viewpoint. "Whoever is unacquainted with my law," says Buddha, "and dies in that state, must return to the earth till he become a perfect Samanean. To achieve this object, he must destroy within himself the trinity of *Maya*. He must extinguish his passions, unite and identify himself with *the law* [the teaching of the secret doctrine], and comprehend the religion of annihilation." [1] Annihilation here refers but to *matter*, as H. P. B. comments, and she quotes further: "Primitive substance is eternal and unchangeable. Its highest revelation is the pure, luminous ether, the boundless infinite space, not a void resulting from the absence of forms, but, on the contrary, *the foundation of all forms*, and anterior to them. 'But the very presence of forms denotes it to be the creation of *Maya*, and all her works are as nothing before the *uncreated* being, *Spirit*, in whose profound and sacred repose all motion must cease forever.' "

[1] Quoted in *Isis*, Vol. I, p. 289.

Annihilation means, therefore, with the Buddhist philosophy, only a dispersion of matter, "in whatever form or *semblance* of form it may be." "When the spiritual *entity* breaks loose forever from every particle of matter, then only it enters upon the eternal and unchangeable Nirvâna. He exists in spirit, in *nothing;* as a form, a shape, a semblance, he is completely *annihilated*, and thus will die no more, for spirit alone is no *Maya*, but the only REALITY in an illusionary universe of ever-passing forms." So the Buddhist asks: "But what is that which has no body, no *form;* which is imponderable, invisible and indivisible; that which exists and yet *is not?*" And the answer, "It is Nirvâna," clearly shows the effort to express in negative terms a positive truth. The positive state is essential being, but no manifestation as such. When the "spiritual entity" spoken of above, enters Nirvâna, it loses objective existence, but enters subjective. To objective minds, this is to become nothing; to subjective, on the contrary, no-thing is actually in manifestation.

Speaking, then, from the point of view of men in, and still more or less of the world, the *Precepts of the Dhammapada* (IX, v. 126) state that: "Some people are born again; evil-doers go to Hell; righteous people go to Heaven; those who are free from all worldly desires attain Nirvâna." [2] And the *Laws of Manu* (Book I, slokas 6 and 7), speaking of the "Lord who exists through Himself, *and who is not to be divulged to the external senses*" is further described as "He that can be perceived only by the spirit [or 'internal organ'], that escapes the organs of sense, who is without visible parts, eternal, the soul of all beings, that none can comprehend, displaying His own splendour" — such an one has attained the state of Nirvâna. [3] "He who thus recognizes the Self through the Self in all created beings [H. P. B. has "the *Supreme Soul*, in his soul, as well as in that of all creatures"], becomes equal (-minded) towards all, and enters the highest state (or the eternal), Brahman," [4] says *Manu* further, the last phrase being rendered by H. P. B. as, "*Finally absorbed* in the bosom of *Brahma*." [5] And this, as Madame Blavatsky suggests, is reminiscent of that hope of every devout Jew, to be "gathered into the bosom of A-Braham." "This word, *absorbed*," she adds, "when it is proved that the Hindus and Buddhists believe in the *immortality* of the spirit, must necessarily mean intimate union, not annihilation."

---

[2] *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. X, p. 35.

[3] G. Bühler's text in the *Sacred Books of the East* series, Vol. XXV, pp. 4, 5, and 6, with notes, gives a slightly different translation for these slokas; but in the notes, he quotes several Eastern commentators on or translators of the original (which presents extraordinary difficulties for the ordinary translator), and one or more of these variants invariably agrees with H. P. B.'s translation as rendered in *Isis*, II, 116. Bühler reads for the sixth sloka: "Then the divine Self-existent (Svayambhû, himself) indiscernible . . ." etc., and in the notes shows that his "indiscernible" is rendered by Medhâtithi "not to be known except by Yogins," and by Govindarâga, Kullûka, and Nârada as, "not perceptible by the external senses," with which cf. H. P. B. Similarly, he renders the seventh sloka: "He who can be perceived by the internal organ (alone), who is subtile, indiscernible, and eternal, who contains all created beings and is inconceivable, shone forth of his own (will)." But the notes offer us, phrase by phrase, the following choices: "He, who can be perceived by the internal organ (or the mind alone)," or "by Yoga-knowledge alone"; for "subtile," — "who is without limbs or parts"; for "who contains all created beings," — who "conceives the idea of creating all beings" — cf. H. P. B.'s "the soul of all beings," i.e. their manas or human soul; and for "shone forth," — "was self-luminous." These variants form an interesting commentary on the meaning of the text, and appear to justify H. P. B.'s choice in every case where she differs from Bühler.

[4] *Manu*, Bk. XII, sloka 125 — op. cit., p. 513.

[5] *Isis*, II, p. 117.

Nirvâna is, then, the very opposite of personal annihilation, but, to use another of H. P. B.'s striking phrases, "Nirvâna means the certitude of personal immortality in *Spirit*" (*Isis*, II, p. 320); it is absolute annihilation "of everything connected with matter or the physical world, and this simply because the latter (as also all in it) is illusion, *mâyâ*" (*Glossary*, p. 232).

Confronted with a metaphysic of such penetration and subtlety, the Western mind asks, how is that practical? Such a conception is so infinitely remote and above our ken that we can hardly glimpse it. What does it mean to be "free from all worldly desires"? And in view of the orthodox heaven, in which each individual is taught to expect the fulfilment of all his longings (so that they are not evil), the extinction of all worldly desires comes as a chill negation. The average man counts his love for family and friends, his art, his religious practices, his charity in its widest sense, his patriotism, as good in themselves. To renounce, to extinguish all these things is to rob him of all that enriches life. To hold out as the true goal of mankind a state of consciousness in which these things are annihilated, is virtually to offer him nothing — and he rejects it. The end of existence, the purpose of life cannot be to denude him of all that makes life worth living.

Yet, as students of Theosophy, Nirvâna is held out to us as the goal, more especially the goal of the disciple — "in him shall men a great and holy Buddha honour." And the confusion of thought seems to arise in part because Nirvâna is equated with heaven. Let it be said at once that Christian theology as such does not conceive of Nirvâna. It may perhaps be true that a Christian philosopher such as Ruysbroek, or a Dante in his Empyrean, through the depth of their mystical experience reached some comprehension of a state of consciousness higher and more refined than that of the ordinary conceptions of heaven, — but Christian theology, while accepting, does not incorporate their revelation into the body of orthodox doctrine. Christian theology is directed towards the materialistic minds of the West — minds steeped in the darkness and grossness of Kali Yuga. It labours under a perpetual handicap in this respect; and, true to a higher intimation, has always been very averse to permitting itself to become committed to any definite pronouncement about after-death states, or to the future evolution of human consciousness. All the conceptions associated with the teachings of the Churches about hell, purgatory and heaven have arisen from popular movements, and have been forced into the body of doctrine by the overwhelming demand of popular opinion. Even so, theology as such speaks with great caution and reserve on these subjects. The Church has been too wise to rob men of those materialistic conceptions which they could alone find suited to their minds. And that the Western mind is still incapable of appreciating the spiritual significance of Nirvâna, confusing it with Devachan (the Eastern equivalent of the Christian and Mohammedan heaven) is manifest from the long-continued misunderstanding of it.

To a man steeped in the fumes of opium or alcohol, a life without them seems a blank, a meaningless and dreary waste. Yet if the drunkard become cured, he can emerge into the full richness of normal, disciplined life. The Western

mind, steeped in materialism, cannot conceive of a state of consciousness freed, not only from the fumes of drugs, not only from the poison of *evil* desires, but freed from *all* those desires and passions, *all* those instincts and inclinations which are inherent in an existence united with matter.

The man of to-day lives by means of his psychic nature: he is aware of life and of himself through the psychic reflections made objective in material forms. Even his mind, his manas, is saturated with the kamic clouds of his own creation. And when an Eastern philosophy comes forward teaching "extinction" of all worldly desires, he sees in it, and sees truly, the extinction of himself. It is impossible to argue with such a man, or to attempt to convince him. The doctrine in truth is not for him. Students of Theosophy would do well to recognize this fact, and to avoid fruitless controversy by learning to recognize the capacity of different individuals. Even in India where the doctrine of Nirvâna has been taught for millenniums, the Buddha set its *true* understanding before his disciples as necessary: to "comprehend the religion of annihilation" was the last of the three steps required to overcome the "trinity of Maya."

Perhaps the only meeting-ground between the Western mind to-day, and the Eastern, on such a subject as Nirvâna, is to be found in individuals of genuine artistic insight. The true artist is not dependent on his painting, on his symphony, for his art. His love for beauty, his appreciation of refinement, his passion for creation, abide within him. He brings them *to* a painting, *to* some artistic creation; and in his understanding of its artistic qualities, he but invokes and nourishes the corresponding reality within, whose consciousness vibrates as himself. He brings them to his own act of creation, and he feels the contrast between that vibrant consciousness which is himself — his love, his yearning, his passion — and the clay with which he works. Take from him those outer forms, and you can never rob him of his art. That finer consciousness has opened to him a wider range of existence; he knows it to be true, and to be independent of material form. In it he finds his greatest reality, in no abstract sense more real than any outer thing in life.

That inner essence, built upon artistic creations and forms, but a distillation of consciousness from them, corresponds to the consciousness of the Nirvânee. We speak of the "purity" of an artist's creation — and by that we mean his freedom from the restraints and limitations of the material and sensuous media in which he wrought. So, in a corresponding sense, is the achievement of the Nirvânee. Ascending the spiral of Chêlaship, purifying himself more and more from the successive degrees of material existence, he establishes ever wider relations with the surrounding Cosmos, till "in Nirvâna the most rarefied individuality is merged at last into INFINITE TOTALITY." He has completely identified himself with his seventh principle, having annihilated his *Ahankâra* or egotistical and *mayavic* principle of self-identity, and has succeeded, not merely in receiving inspiration as does the artist, but in making all his thoughts correspond with the eternal laws of Nature, and becoming a co-worker with Nature. So, as the Master K. H. wrote: "The greater the progress towards deliverance, the less this will be the case [*i.e.* to be under the 'influence

of our earthly connection'], until, to crown all, human and purely individual feelings, blood-ties and friendship, patriotism and race predilection, will all give way, to become blended into one universal feeling, the only true and holy, the only unselfish and eternal one — Love, an Immense Love for humanity as a whole" (*Occult World*, p. 152) — what the *Voice* calls "COMPASSION ABSOLUTE."

II

Once having discovered that Nirvâna is not the empty nothingness that early misunderstanding attributed to it, there remains to seek some indication of the positive aspects of this, our goal. For it cannot be sufficient to state the negative side; one must make the attempt to take one's stand in the spiritual order, to regard all that is earthbound as maya or illusion, and to see in spiritual consciousness the true reality. In the nature of things such an attempt is fraught with difficulties, and without some pioneer effort of the imagination, no approach to understanding could ever be achieved. "The first thing a Theosophist should do is to *form an ideal*," says Cavé.

To begin with: why, if Nirvâna is our goal, should it be renounced by the Bodhisattva? Again, why, if Nirvâna is to be renounced, are Enoch, Buddha and others denominated Nirvânees, having attained that state in a given incarnation?

The answer would seem to be in the full appreciation of two fundamental principles — first, that as everything in our Cosmos is a septenate, Nirvâna must be sevenfold; and second, that the attainment of Nirvâna is the attainment of a certain range or new order of consciousness. To enter this new order of consciousness, to awake in it, to acquire full growth in it, must imply a previous passage through a critical state to the new one beyond, comparable in Nature to the transformations of ice to water, or vapour to gas. Once the disciple has passed the Dhyana gate (of the *Fourth* Path), he enters a new state, called in the *Voice* the "Titiksha state." "O Narjol, thou art safe" — the critical stage is passed. The Titiksha state is defined as "one of supreme indifference; submission, if necessary, to what is called 'pleasures and pains for all,' but deriving neither pleasure nor pain from such submission" (Compare *Light on the Path*, note 7, p. 21). At this point "A Master has arisen, a Master of the Day," *i.e.* for a whole Manvantara. "*Now* he shall surely reach his great reward!" exclaims the *Voice*, but answers "*Nay*, . . . those gifts and powers are not for Self," — and there follows that sublime passage about the "Guardian Wall" which even the Pragmatist, William James, saw fit to quote and to admire.

Nothing could be clearer than that the law of evolution and progress, here on the ascending arc, cannot cease with a successful achievement of a new state, however exalted. In any event this whole section in the *Voice* refers to one who is in "the *fifth* state of *Raja Yoga*" (p. 68, note 1), an Arhan, who "though he can see the Past, the Present, and the Future, is not yet the highest Initiate. . . . Three higher grades have still to be conquered by the Arhan

who would reach the apex of the ladder of Arhatship" (*Secret Doctrine*, I, 227). Therefore, though a new state is reached, a new order of consciousness entered upon, the "end" is not yet. The seventh gate (Dhyana) of the Fourth Path has been passed, but there remain three further Paths — the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh — each with its seven gates. The consciousness here dealt with, then, would seem to be that of the Fifth Path, with *its* seven degrees.

At the very threshold, therefore, of this new state, the one addressed as "Narjol," and who in the *terrestrial* sense is a Bodhisattva or Manushi Buddha (cf. *Glossary*), is confronted with a choice. That choice has its correspondence whenever critical states are passed: for instance, does the man newly initiated on the way of discipleship, choose to acquire knowledge and power for himself alone, or is his real desire to serve humanity, acquiring knowledge and power merely to lay them at the feet of the Master, as a volunteer in his Cause?

"OM! I believe it is not all the Arhats that get of the Nirvânic Path the sweet fruition.

"OM! I believe that the Nirvâna-Dharma is entered not by all the Buddhas. . . .

"Can there be bliss when all that lives must suffer? Shalt thou be saved and hear the whole world cry?" There is the appeal — "Thou art enlightened — choose thy way."

If there is progress possible, there is also regression possible. But, once past the critical state, there is no immediate fall into the *old* types of failure. The failure in the new state, while following the principles which underlie the evolutionary process of the universe, must be of a new kind. To approximate an understanding of what this means, one must form some conception of the scale of values in the new state.

The *Voice*, taken with other works, gives us a hint as to this scale of values. Nirvâna is described in terms of detachment from all that is material and worldly, that which "can be perceived only by the spirit, that escapes the organs of sense, who is without visible parts, eternal, the soul of all beings, that none can comprehend, displaying His own splendour." If we use the word purification to convey the idea of complete detachment in this sense, then the greater the degree of purification, the greater the attainment in the Nirvânic state. Thus in the *Glossary* (*sub* Dharmakâya) three divisions or vestures (Trikâya) of those Buddhakchêtras, or seven forms of Buddha, are given, who have attained to Nirvânic consciousness. The other four are not named. In order these three are: "(1) Nirmânakâya, (2) Sambhogakâya, (3) and Dharmakâya, the last being the most sublimated of all, as it places the ascetic on the threshold of Nirvâna." The scale of values here is, strictly speaking, in degrees of purification, as defined above. But in the *Voice* the order is reversed, and those who "don the *Dharmakâya* robe and cross to the other shore" — are called *Pratyêka Buddhas*, "those Bodhisattvas who . . . caring nothing for the woes of mankind or to help it, but only for their own *bliss*, (they) enter Nirvâna and — disappear from the sight and the hearts of men. In Northern Buddhism a 'Pratyêka Buddha' is a synonym for spiritual Selfishness." Still,

in the scale of purification originally used, a Dharmakâya Buddha, who chooses Nirvâna, outranks a Nirmânakâya, — though "the innate and right popular perception," owing to the self-sacrifice and renunciation of the Nirmânakâya — the "Buddha of Compassion" — holds the latter in higher reverence. So we are told that to-day, in the Lodge, there are Masters far down in the lower ranks, before whom, when they occasionally rise to speak, the whole Lodge stands to listen. Rank is rank, attainment is attainment, the sacrifice is a real sacrifice. The Nirmânakâya, because he keeps in touch with humanity, assuming form after form as best suits his purposes, does by that very fact set himself below the higher stages, where the purification or detachment from outer existence is complete. We are told that Buddha has now "gone on," and having become a Nirmânakâya, and achieved his immediate purpose, has taken a higher step *as such*, thereby lifting the whole level of those who follow, with him. Some, apparently, make their sacrifice, become Nirmânakâyas, remain for a while in the lower ranks in touch with humanity, and are then able to rise higher, perhaps because their Chêlas attain such stature as to make this possible (cf. the *Letters That Have Helped Me*, Vol. I, pp. 14 and 68, on the *Guruparampara* chain).

Above Dharmakâya are, therefore, the only *absolute* Nirvânic states. The Nirmânakâyas and Sambhogakâyas are Nirvânees, however, because they have attained that state of consciousness. Nothing is told us of the latter that I can find, except that they add to the attainments of a Nirmânakâya (not one descended from the higher degree) "a great and complete knowledge," and "the additional lustre of 'three perfections,' one of which is entire obliteration of all earthly concerns." From what we are told, it might appear to be a fair inference that the Dharmakâya, who takes his bliss now, and therefore becomes a Pratyêka Buddha will, after the balance of the Manvantara, plus a Pralaya of reward is past, have to start all over again at that point where he first consciously made the selfish choice which led to the final failure, and, his previous capital expended, win once more the opportunity to choose the higher way. To enter absolute Nirvâna is to enter immediately individual Pralaya, with no rebirth possible till after the Mahâ Pralaya (*Secret Doctrine*, I, 398; cf. II, 242).

Of the Nirmânakâyas much has been written. We are told that among that third of the Dhyânîs (Dhyân Chohans or Planetary Archangels) who incarnated on earth, "Some of these were Nirmânakâyas from other Manvantaras. Thus we see them, in all the *Puranas*, reappearing on this Globe . . . as Kings, Rishis, and Heroes" (*Secret Doctrine*, II, 98, cf. I, 287). St. John appears to refer to these in the *Apocalypse*, when he writes about "the great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads," whose "tail drew the *third* part of the stars of heaven and did cast them to the earth" (XII, 3, 4). Note that a Dhyâni Buddha is known as an "Angel of the Star," or a Planetary Spirit (*Secret Doctrine*, I, 626–7). H. P. B. also says that the Dhyân Chohans "are all in Nirvâna" (I, 142). Buddha was a Nirmânakâya (and is that now *and more?*), "higher than whom, on

account of the great renunciation and sacrifice for mankind, there is none known." Enoch is another so designated, "and some monks;" so we see that the state of consciousness of a Nirvânee of this degree can be carried over from a past Manvantara and also attained in the present cycle of evolution on earth.

Thus there are apparently two classes of Nirmânakâyas, those who have "either voluntarily renounced Nirvâna [the 'absolute' Nirvâna] for the good of mankind, or who not yet having reached it, remain invisible on Earth" (*Secret Doctrine*, II, 650–651) — that is, those who reached the Dharmakâya degree and reverted to the lower, in order to keep in touch with, and thus be enabled more immediately to help mankind; and those who, though Nirmânakâyas, were nothing more, not yet having ascended through the Sambhogakâya state to the Dharmakâya, thus facing "absolute" Nirvâna. "They prefer to remain invisibly (in Spirit, so to speak) in the world, and contribute towards men's salvation by influencing them to follow the Good Law, *i.e.*, lead them on the Path of Righteousness." H. P. B. says Jacob Bœhme was "watched over and guided" by Nirmânakâyas (I, 536); and that Nirmânakâyas are the only spiritual entities that can interfere so far as to take possession of, and use, mediums — who are usually controlled by "Elementaries" (I, 254). The *Catechism* of the Inner Schools, quoted by H. P. B. says: "The Inner Man of the First . . . [name not disclosed] only changes his body from time to time; he is ever the same, knowing neither rest nor Nirvâna [the 'absolute' Nirvâna again], spurning Devachan and remaining constantly on Earth for the salvation of mankind. Out of the seven Virgin-men [Kumâras, or Nirmânakâyas from a preceding Manvantara] four sacrificed themselves for the sins of the world and the instruction of the ignorant, to remain till the end of the present Manvantara. Though unseen, they are ever present. When people say of one of them, 'He is dead,' behold, he is alive and under another form. These are the Head, the Heart, the Soul, and the Seed of undying Knowledge [Jñâna]. Thou shalt never speak, O Lanoo, of these great ones [Maha . . .] before a multitude, mentioning them by their names. The wise alone will understand" (*Secret Doctrine*, II, 294–5). Thus a Nirmânakâya is "verily one, who whether . . . an adept or a yogi during life, has since become a member of that invisible Host which ever protects and watches over Humanity within Karmic limits. Mistaken for a 'Spirit,' a Deva, God himself, etc., a Nirmânakâya is ever a protecting, compassionate, verily a *guardian* angel, to him who becomes worthy of his help. Whatever objection may be brought forward against this doctrine; however much it is denied, because forsooth, it has never been hitherto made public in Europe and therefore since it is unknown to Orientalists, it must needs be 'a myth of modern invention' — no one will be bold enough to say that this idea of helping suffering mankind at the price of one's own almost interminable self-sacrifice, is not one of the grandest and noblest that was ever evolved from the human brain" (*Glossary*, p. 231).

A. G.

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS

XII

St. Ignatius Loyola

GREAT as are other saints and founders of the Christian Orders, it seems to the writer that Ignatius towers as a colossus, above them all. This opinion is not based merely upon his possession of gifts and faculties that the world prizes, or merely upon achievements that the world would call great — though in neither of these respects is he found wanting. His greatness, the true greatness of any religious person, is the degree of his approach to his Master, the measure of light that shines through him from the Master. Too often the saints approach their Master by a mere thread of a path; they have but a single slit open to him in the fast closed fortress of their natures. Ignatius differs from them. He is more like a circle than a single line. He had many avenues of approach running from his circumference toward the constant centre, Christ. In consequence, he passes on to others more of the Master's infinity of nature. Fundamentally, this amounts to saying that Ignatius loved more deeply and passionately — a conclusion that must stand, even though it seem ungracious in its reflection upon Francis, Bernard, Benedict and others.

Why then is he so unpopular among Protestants, while Francis of Assisi and others so irresistibly charm? But did not his Master himself rouse many prejudices and hatreds? Is not much of the present popularity of Christ in the Western world based upon a misconception of his character — as "a good God" who indulges humanity and requires little effort from mankind? With Ignatius, as with his Master, there is no half-way position possible. It is adherence or dislike. In Ignatius's face there is reflected something of the Master's otherworldly commission from the Father. That otherworldly origin is not explained to the merely curious. Only those who share it, and loyally support it, can have any understanding of it. Others, finding their curiosity unanswered or rebuffed, turn away with irritable dislike. From a worldly point of view, "inscrutable" is, perhaps, the best word to describe the portrait of Ignatius that is reproduced in most biographies. People are inclined to associate something sinister with the inscrutable. But Ignatius's face is what it is, because he had thrown open to the Master every avenue of his nature, and had closed them to all others, save through the Master.

The story of his conversion is fairly well known. He was a Spanish military officer, a nobleman. During a siege, the bone of his leg was shattered. The French (who were the hostile force) permitted his withdrawal to his brother's home, for the treatment of the injury. Twice it was clumsily set, causing a protrusion of the bone when the bandages were withdrawn. Twice he had the fracture reset, though with prolonged torture, inasmuch as mechanical devices were needed to stretch the shrunken leg. The days were long, the hours tedious.

He had always found pleasure in the romances of chivalry, and asked for such stories now to divert his attention. None was at hand. He was offered as substitute, it might seem in mockery, some lives of the saints. Those narratives caught his interest. He began to contrast his own efforts, successes and failures with the heroic fortitude of the saints. Before he was aware of it, the goal of the saints loomed as a new beacon for his own ambition, hitherto of this world; and his purpose became set. His brother's household noted the change taking place in him and tried to dissuade him from his undeclared resolution. But when his leg was completely healed, Ignatius turned his back on his friends and journeyed alone to a religious shrine high in the mountains. There he offered his life to religion, placing his weapons on the altar and watching as a knight in vigil. The next day he exchanged his knight's attire for a beggar's and went afoot to a town, Manresa, where, for a time, he lodged in a Dominican monastery, tending the sick and poor. After some months, he left the Dominicans and withdrew to a solitary cave outside the town.

All our information about Ignatius comes from orthodox Catholic sources, where it is interpreted in a conventional manner. His own *Autobiography* gives some aid for a re-interpretation of incidents, both by its reticence, and by creating an impression that more could be told if it were advisable. It gives the impression of much being held back, of only so much spoken of, and in such a way as would be understood. It may be fanciful to build much upon that reticence, yet it seems a possible hint and clue. The period in the cave is usually represented as one of fasting and prayer, during which Ignatius's experience deepened, and he became aware of a mission. May not the cave experience have enabled him to draw into his brain some consciousness of his Lodge connection?

Let us assume theoretically that he was a servant of the Lodge, incarnated in a noble, Spanish, Catholic personality, to work for the Lodge. Let us assume, further, that the Lodge, with its long views, foresaw the need to counterbalance the "Reformation," by emphasizing the value of self-abnegation, discipline, and obedience to properly constituted authority. Let us assume that the fabric of Christian theology needed stretching, and think of Luther pulling mightily upon one corner of it, but, because the strain was all in one direction, threatening to pull it askew. It is easy then to imagine Ignatius as sent to exemplify, in his own effort toward discipleship, the importance of the principles which Luther was endangering, and, by throwing his weight against that of Luther, to restore the balance and equalize the strain. When he began to be conscious of otherworldly things, the next step might be to burn upon his devout Catholic brain some glimpse of the realm of truth beyond Catholic confines,—to bring him face to face with other Lodge servants, incarnate or discarnate. After he had won his birthright for his new personality, namely, consciousness of his true country, of the vast realms of truth beyond the narrow limits of Catholicism, he could then turn back into the ordinary world, and battle valiantly for the measure of truth contained within the Catholic field. But the very nature of his mission, on this hypothesis, would have tended to limit his consciousness and to have kept him in the attitude of a partizan.

Let us think of his situation in the light of our own experience. How confused some of us became about our natural duties, when Theosophy first opened its long vista before us! Ignatius was human. Would it be surprising if, when the wonders of the spiritual world were brought back to his consciousness, in the cave of Manresa, as we have supposed, there should have been misinterpretations by the Catholic personality? Some of those misinterpretations took the form of excessive austerities. Such excesses were idolized by devout Catholics, but Ignatius himself, afterwards, called them ill-judged. Guided still further by our own experience, may we not think of him as coming gradually to a truer understanding of the work that lay ahead?

A journey to the Holy Land, to worship at the shrines, and to assist other pilgrims — that, for some time to come, was the way his outer task presented itself to him. Francis of Assisi and St. Teresa also had at first thought of the Holy Land as their field of activity. Ignatius was to find that the Holy Land was immediately about him, and the Cross of the Passion forever at hand. But he actually made a journey to Palestine, starting in February, 1523, his travel thither and back to Spain taking just thirteen months, till March, 1524. His passage and sustenance on the way, had to be begged. Charitable people gave him money for his journey from time to time. But money he would not keep; he distributed it in his turn. He reached Jerusalem, after accumulated difficulty and pain. Some Franciscan monks were stationed in Jerusalem, a *modus vivendi* having been arranged with the Turks. They were kind and cordial to the new comer at first, but his fervour alarmed the Prior, who feared it might breed trouble with the Moslems, as the *modus vivendi* must not be disturbed. So Ignatius was bidden to go home.[1] He travelled back to Spain as he had come, begging his way and suffering extreme hardship.

The next eleven years, 1524–1535, were spent in gaining an education, and in gathering companions. At first his studies were in Spanish schools; but, in 1528, he went to Paris, and he remained there till 1535, receiving the degree of Master of Arts. As he had journeyed back from the Holy Land, in disappointment over the failure of his mission, by a sudden interior perception (they were frequent in his life), he understood that the work for which he was being prepared could not succeed unless he had a thorough education. At this time he was thirty-three years old. He had filled an honourable position in the world as a trusted soldier of his King. To put himself to school with boys and young men, was a humiliation requiring fortitude and courage. He had both. With the whole-heartedness that marks his character, he resolved to start at the beginning and master Latin, at the same time begging his bread. He calculated that two years would be necessary for this elementary work. He faced it, and prepared for it with characteristic prudence. It is narrated that he made little progress in Latin, because he found it difficult to withdraw his attention from religion to lessons. Finally, he requested the school master to whip him for inattention, just as he would any boy. After that request the studies advanced.

[1] The Franciscans had received from the Pope authority to receive or dismiss pilgrims.

A foundation for learning was thus secured. But the one purpose of Ignatius's life was always uppermost, — to win people to the knowledge and love of Christ. However closely he might give himself to such necessary work as study, he never lost his perspective or forgot his chief object. He is a splendid example of attention rightly centred. His outer work was carried on as a duty auxiliary to the real purpose of his life. While he studied Latin at Barcelona, with boys, he would speak of life and of the soul to whoever would listen, speaking directly from his heart and experience. He made some friends among people of good life. They recognized his sincerity and consecration. He also made enemies. He usually had someone within the Church hot on his track — someone who resented the fact that an obscure layman should show more devotion and speak with more conviction than the established dignitaries. Of the people to whom he spoke, three, young men, told him they were ready to devote their lives to the service of Christ. They were sincere enough to accompany him, when the two years of Latin at Barcelona were finished, to the town of Alcalá (near Madrid) where Ignatius planned to continue his education in the university. This was in 1526.

At Alcalá he encountered the Inquisition and experienced his first imprisonment. His only crime was his piety and zeal. Here was a layman speaking fervently of Christ, serving in humble ministrations to the sick and poor, and living austerely. He must be a survivor, it was thought, of the Albigenses or other heretical sects that had made trouble in France and Spain. But examination could detect no heresy in his belief. He was therefore acquitted (the imprisonment had been brief), but he was told that he and his companions must abandon their beggar's garb, which set them apart from other students, and that there must be no further teaching or preaching until a regular course in theology should have been completed. To complete such a course would require four years. Ignatius was unwilling to accept the terms, to suppress for so long the chief interest of his life. He left Alcalá and went to the university of Salamanca. He had been at Alcalá a little more than a year. His three young friends went with him.

At Salamanca, suspicion and imprisonment began at once. Ignatius and one of his friends were chained together by the foot in the public prison. The two other companions were imprisoned later. The charge made by the Inquisition, as Ignatius gives it in the *Autobiography*, was very simple. "You are teaching," they said, "about sins and virtues. To do that one must have studied theology or be led by the Holy Ghost. You have not studied. Therefore it must be the Holy Ghost who instructs you." But the examiners were not able to lead their humble victim to entrap himself in presumption. The result was the same as at Alcalá; no heresy could be found in his beliefs. On the other hand, the behaviour of the little group of friends in prison was exemplary and won much sympathy. The convicts in the prison broke loose and escaped. Ignatius and his friends refused to join them. The examiners, convinced of his innocence, set him free, but again with unbearable stipulations as to what he should speak and should not speak. Ignatius, accordingly, left Salamanca. Returning to

Barcelona to the first friends he had made, he told them of the continual interference with his plans by the Spanish Church authorities, accepted from those friends a gift of money, and set out for Paris, for the university. [2] This was at the end of 1528.

In Paris, while still subject to suspicion and a certain amount of persecution, he was not hindered from continuing his religious work. He remained there till the completion of his studies in 1535.

The gift of money, on which he had counted for maintenance while studying, was stolen from him, and he had to take up his former practice of begging bread. But the summer months proved amply long for the asking of alms, as he received enough at that time to carry him through the winters. He spent one summer thus in England, the others in the Low Countries. He preached and taught less, and gave more time to study. But quietly he was trying to win associates. Those at Salamanca had not kept their promise to join him. After a while, three students of good birth and good minds told him they wished to devote themselves, with him, to a religious life; they left their domiciles and joined him in his devotions. The university professors were enraged at this influence, gained by an impecunious student over three promising scholars, and they persuaded the Rector that Ignatius deserved a public whipping. Ignatius heard what awaited him. He quietly asked for an opportunity to speak briefly with the Rector. To the amazement of the professors and students who had assembled to witness the whipping (Ignatius was now nearly forty years old), the Rector, instead of leading in an abject victim, kneeled down before Ignatius, in the presence of all, and with tears asked pardon of Ignatius and of God for the intended outrage.

The three students at Paris proved as unstable as the three at Salamanca, and did not long continue their devotions. Six others, however, were touched by his quiet sincerity; five were Spaniards, one a Savoyard. This third group of friends continued faithful. The best known of them is the Spaniard, Francis Xavier. Ignatius drew them by the fervour of his love for the Master, — drew them to strive for a communion of love and service. He spoke to them from his own experience and conviction, and won them to share his effort for discipleship, as well as any outer work that might arise out of that effort. To what extent he may have spoken to them of the real inner experience which we assume for him, the face to face experience with realms beyond the ken of orthodox Catholicism, must remain uncertain. The reticence in Ignatius's *Autobiography*, the hidden meaning sometimes discernible in his words,[3] the caution with which his inner experiences are mentioned, the absence of psychic colouring from his mention of inner experience, and the actual fruits of his labours — these warrant, we believe, the hypothesis that Ignatius had direct intercourse with living citizens of the spiritual world, with Lodge members. A similar hypothesis is not possible for his associates. Francis Xavier, the

[2] The young men who were his companions at Alcalá and Salamanca promised that they would follow him to Paris.

[3] For example, what he said about the name of his group, the "Battalion of Jesus", — "that it had a deeper root than the world knew of, and it could not be altered" (*Life* by Stewart Rose, p. 267).

best known of them, is a heroic saint, splendid in courage, fortitude and perseverance. But when that is said (and it is a tribute any one might crave), all is said. Xavier was in no sense an Occultist.

The outer plan that Ignatius unfolded to his group of friends was still one of missionary effort in Palestine. In 1534, he felt that these men whom he had been training individually, might be ready to make a vow. They all met together, and Lefèvre, the Savoyard (he is called Faber in most English books), the one priest of the group, celebrated Holy Communion. Ignatius spoke. All made a vow of poverty, chastity, and labour in the Holy Land. All agreed to meet at Venice in January, 1537 (by that time, all would have completed their studies at the university), as the first stage of their journey toward Palestine. Ignatius, ever prudent, introduced a clause, that, if they should be delayed in their journey to Palestine for more than a year after the specified date, 1537, they should all go to Rome, and place themselves at the Pope's disposal for any work the Pope might have in hand.

In 1535, at the age of 44, Ignatius completed the long course of academic studies he had imposed upon himself. He had felt that academic training was necessary for the unknown work ahead of him. As that work appeared, as yet, to be nothing more than a kind of hermit's life in the Holy Land, a life of self-discipline in imitation of Christ, his perseverance and fortitude in hardship and persecution are all the more remarkable. He might so easily have excused himself, when discouraged, asserting that a long preparation of that particular kind was unreasonable, and unsuitable for what he believed his life work was to be. But he continued steadfastly, and succeeded through all difficulty. He received the degree of Master of Arts from the university in 1535. Then, the biographies relate, he went back to Spain for three months.

We may doubt if the whole truth is contained in the two reasons named by the biographers for this visit. They say, first, that Ignatius was ill, and friends and physicians felt he must have a change from the Paris air; and, secondly, that there were certain matters of business to arrange with his brothers before he left Europe, as he thought, forever. This business concerned the disposition of property, and seemed necessary in view of his life of poverty. It is also stated that several of his companions in Paris requested him to be their ambassador, and to arrange similar matters for them with their families, in view of the vow of poverty they had made. Ignatius carried these business matters through successfully.

With the various family matters in Spain settled, Ignatius set out for Venice, there to await his friends, who, with the priest Lefèvre as a guide in place of Ignatius, were completing their university studies at Paris. At the time named, January, 1537, all met at Venice. But they never reached the Holy Land. War with the Turks hindered travel. A new epoch in the history of Ignatius then opened — the recognition in Rome, by the authorities, of the sincerity of his effort, and of the possible value of his services. As in the case of other founders, Benedict, Bernard and Francis, that recognition by the ecclesiastical authorities gave new life to the diseased Church, with a consequent purifying of society.

While Ignatius became a force for the preservation in Catholicism of vital principles threatened by the excesses of "reform," we may see this as but one consequence of his aspiration to discipleship. His opposition to Luther's errors was a logical by-product of the main purpose of his life. His example, in that critical sixteenth century, is one to be followed profitably to-day, when the world again, even more than in the sixteenth century, perhaps, is full of evils that need reforming. Compare Luther's dates with those of Ignatius; Ignatius's effort will then appear truly as a thing that by spiritual guidance gradually grew from a spiritual germ. Luther was born in 1483 and was eight years older than Ignatius. Luther became an Augustinian monk in 1505, was ordained priest in 1507, and in 1517 protested openly and defiantly against evils in the Church. In 1520, Luther was excommunicated. In 1524, Luther renounced his monastic vows and, in 1525, completed the renunciation by marrying a renegade nun. Luther was thus fully committed to his course in 1520, when Ignatius was born a babe into the spiritual life by that fortunate wound to his leg in 1521.

The brief sketch of Ignatius's career given in this article seeks to show him as a candidate for discipleship, — a man fired with love for his Master, and endeavouring to conform his life to the Master's. His successful self-discipline drew around him other religious natures. His steadfastness in discipline, for love of his Master, gradually and naturally resulted, in 1534, in the vindication of those monastic vows which ten years earlier Luther had repudiated.

Here is seen, with a clearness not to be evaded, the world-wide influence that may radiate from the smallest duty faithfully performed for the Master. During the Great War of 1914, many groaned at the restricted sphere of their action; they could not go to the front, and, except through gifts of money, they seemed able to take no part in the conflict where all their interest was centred. They found it hard to believe that they could make decisive contributions to the fight, by whole-heartedly doing their routine tasks with prayer, sacrifice, and love. What else did Ignatius do? Did he, at thirty-five, enjoy learning Latin with lazy school boys? Did he gain wonderful illuminations as to the bearing of Latin and learning upon a disciple's life? But he persevered through all difficulties in what he had accepted as duty. While he thus persevered quietly, and with no attention diverted to outside issues, certain fundamental principles of the religious life were being attacked in the world. Laxity, and even profligacy, had discredited the old religious Orders, — discredited them even among staunch supporters. Most decidedly a reform was needed, a thorough-going reform; needed, as in the age of Benedict, as in the age of Bernard, as in the age of Francis. Luther took one method of reform — the method of attack, of destruction. Without doubt, his efforts exposed and ended some of the evils in the Church. But what did Luther become? In his forty-second year, a monk and a priest, he married a nun. Ignatius took another method of reform — to make himself over as Christ would wish him to be. The energy and attention required for self-discipline left Ignatius no time or desire to attack abuses in the Church. In his forty-fifth year, Ignatius's unobtrusive efforts had brought together a little band of friends, a mere hand-

ful. But, like the Apostolic Twelve, they were to demonstrate again the magical power of the evangelical virtues, poverty, chastity and obedience. Fired with self-giving, they went to the savage and the degenerate, to the natives of America, India and China. They renovated and extended Christianity.

To present religious, social and political conditions at the time of the Reformation would make too long an article, for that period is also the time of the Renaissance; and it would require volumes to treat it adequately. But it may be possible very briefly to indicate some of the conditions that Ignatius was to influence. Dominic died in 1221, Francis of Assisi in 1226. Ignatius was born in 1491. The intervening period of nearly three centuries had given ample time for the stirring influence of the preaching friars to die away. Savonarola, a Dominican, became Prior in Florence, in 1491, and started a religious revival by his zealous preaching. Before the end of the decade Savonarola was in defiance and revolt, and his execution stayed further reform.

The constant need of the Church for reform had been ministered to through the centuries by Religious Orders. That ever-present need had been greatly increased by the spread of information about classical civilization. There were a few, but only a few, like Mirandola, who had sufficient philosophical breadth, and morality sufficiently austere, to persevere in their Christian faith and practice, while they welcomed the relics of a past age as evidence of the unity of all life. Too many welcomed that outgrown civilization because they thought it gave them dispensation from effort that was burdensome to the flesh; they threw overboard their half-hearted pretence of religion. In Greece and in the Roman Empire, they saw nations that had attained a splendid height of civilization, without any aid, it seemed to them, from Christianity. To achieve, as Greece and Rome had achieved, a splendid civilization, rich glory in this world, beauty of art, and truth of science, all this now seemed possible to the new nations that had sprung out of the wreck of the Roman Empire. These new nations were very young, and were marked by the ignorance and conceit of youth. They knew nothing of supramundane (Lodge) politics. The danger was imminent that, in achieving their worldly ambition, they might seriously impair the advance of the new religion, Christianity, through which alone they had been brought into being from the ruins of Rome. While Ignatius was regaining strength, both physical and spiritual, in that memorable year 1521, the great Italian Titans were coming to full power; Michelangelo, born in 1477, Titian, born in 1477, and Raphael, born in 1483 and dying prematurely in 1520. The danger was grave.

If it be truly understood, the splendour of that Italian civilization was the first flower produced by the tender Christian plant. It looked as if the Master's gifts might be turned against him, as they have so often been turned; as if the discovery of the art and science and rich civilisations of antiquity, which had all risen to their height through the observance of self-restraint and moral law, were to be made an excuse for a wild riot of self-indulgence.

By his living example Ignatius checked the tendency to deform what the

Master had inspired. He went to work, not negatively, with a Savonarola bonfire of vanities, but constructively. He is the greatest of the many artists and geniuses of that period. He worked, not differently from the other artists, but more thoroughly, and he was wiser than they in his choice of material. They chose pigment and bronze and verse. He worked upon animate human nature. He cut away in his own nature all that was excessive, he straightened all that was crooked, he brought light to all that was shadowed, he laboured to make all glow with beauty.[4] On the altar of his heart, he offered to his Divine Master the smiles, tears, hopes, and fears of all his life. The offer was accepted. So, in that Europe of wild confusion, of aspiration and revolt, Christ's Kingdom came in that one heart. There, on earth, was kindled a flame of love like the Seraph's adoration in Heaven!

Soul of Christ, sanctify me.
Body of Christ, save me.
Blood of Christ, inebriate me.
Water from the side of Christ, wash me.
Passion of Christ, strengthen me.
O good Jesu, hear me;
Within Thy wounds hide me;
Suffer me not to be separated from Thee;
From the malignant enemy defend me;
At the hour of my death call me,
And bid me come unto Thee;
That with Thy Saints I may praise Thee,
For ever and ever. Amen.[5]

C. C. CLARK.

(To be continued)

---

[4] "Withdraw into yourself and look. And if you do not find yourself beautiful as yet, do as does the creator of a statue that is to be made beautiful; he cuts away here, he smoothes there, he makes this line lighter, this other purer until he has shown a beautiful face upon his statue. So do you also; cut away all that is excessive, straighten all that is crooked, bring light to all that is shadowed, labour to make all glow with beauty, and do not cease chiselling your statue until there shall shine out on you the God-like splendour of virtue, until you shall see the final goodness surely established in the stainless shrine." — *Plotinus*.

[5] St. Ignatius's prayer.

TAO=TEH=KING

An Interpretation of Lao Tse's Book of the Way and of Righteousness

VII

60. *To govern a great kingdom, one should imitate him who cooks a little fish.*

When the ruler governs the kingdom according to the Way, the spirits do not show their power.

It is not that the demons lack power, but that the demons do not injure men.

It is not that the spirits cannot injure men, but that the Saint himself does not injure men.

Neither the Saint nor the spirits injure them; this is why their power is blended.

THE simile in the first sentence, concerning the great kingdom and the little fish, has the same rather startling quaintness as a former simile for the impartiality of Heaven and Earth, which "regard all creatures as men regard the straw dogs" used in sacrifices. If we accept the text as being what Lao Tse actually wrote, we may imagine him watching some peasant woman cooking little fish, handling them somewhat daintily, careful that they shall be cooked enough, but not too much; and saying to himself, or perhaps even to her: "That is exactly how a kingdom should be governed, with tact and discretion!"

There may be much more than our sceptical day and generation would willingly believe, in Lao Tse's thought that spirits are subject to the Saint; natural forces which we think of as merely mechanical, may have something of consciousness, and a consciousness responsive to the divine powers in man, so that "even the winds and the sea obey him."

61. *The great kingdom shall be as the rivers and the seas, in which all the waters under heaven are united.*

In the world, this is the part of the feminine: through quietude it constantly triumphs over the masculine. This quietude is a kind of abasement.

This is why, if the great kingdom abase itself before the little kingdoms, it will win the little kingdoms.

If the little kingdoms abase themselves before the great kingdom, they will win the great kingdom.

This is why some abase themselves in order to receive, while others abase themselves in order to be received.

The great kingdom desires only to unite and guide mankind.

The little kingdom desires only to be permitted to serve mankind.

Therefore both obtain what they desire.

But the great must abase themselves.

If the teaching of Lao Tse in many ways approaches the spirit of Christianity, this is, perhaps, the most distinctively Christian section in the whole work. We have not only the often repeated saying of the Master Christ, "He that shall humble himself shall be exalted," but the example of the Master, "who, being in the form of God, counted it not a thing to be grasped to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the Cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him."

We may believe that the Master Christ made himself pitiful, because pity is the final appeal to hard and self-centred human hearts, and that self-abasement in order to make this appeal is of the essence of his sacrifice. And we may also believe that what the Master Christ did visibly, all Masters do in the invisible world, making themselves bond-servants of mankind.

We have often found reason to believe that, when Lao Tse speaks of "the great kingdom," he means the spiritual kingdom, the Lodge of Masters. And it would seem that "the little kingdom" here means mankind, and also the individual disciple. We can thus see a very real meaning in the saying that, "if the great kingdom abase itself before the little kingdom, it will win the little kingdom"; and, if "the little kingdom" means the disciple, then it is profoundly true that "the little kingdom desires only to be permitted to serve."

62. *The Way is the refuge of all beings; it is the treasure of the righteous man and the support of the wicked.*

Excellent words can bring us riches, honourable acts can lift us above others. If a man be not righteous, should he be driven away with contempt?

For his sake the Emperor was established and the three ministers were appointed.

It is good to hold up a tablet of jade, or to mount a chariot with four horses; but it is better to remain still, in order to advance in the Way.

Why did the ancients esteem the Way?

Is it not because the Way is found daily without seeking? Is it not because the guilty gain through It liberty and life?

This is why the Way is the noblest thing in the world.

Here again we have ideas in entire harmony with the teaching of Christ: "But go ye and learn what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice: for I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." That this is the meaning attributed to the words of Lao Tse by his followers is shown by the commentary: "If a man has faults, it is enough for him to amend in order to become righteous. This is why he should not be driven away because of his faults. If, in antiquity, the Emperor and three ministers were established, it was precisely in order to instruct and reform the vicious." The tradition is, that the minister held a tablet of jade before his face when he entered the Emperor's presence; to hold up a tablet of jade thus means to enter the presence of the Emperor.

Regarding the closing sentences, the commentators say: "The wise men of

old did not make long journeys in search of the Way; they returned to their pristine purity and found It within themselves."

63. *The wise man works without working, he is employed without being employed, he savours that which is without savour.*

Great things or small things, many or few, are equal in his eyes.

He repays injuries with kindness.

He begins with easy things when considering hard things; with little things when planning great things.

The hardest things in the world began of necessity by being easy.

The greatest things in the world began of necessity by being small.

Therefore the Saint seeks not at all to do great things; this is why he can accomplish great things.

He who promises lightly, rarely keeps his word.

He who finds many things easy, of necessity meets many difficulties.

Therefore the Saint finds all things difficult; this is why, to his life's end, he meets with no difficulties.

The principle of detachment has already been considered. Of the later sentences, a commentator says: "Among the men of the world, there is not one who does not fear great things and disdain little things. It is only when things have become difficult that he plans them, and when they have become great that he undertakes them, and he continually fails. The Saint puts on the same level things great and small, many and few; he fears all equally; he finds them all equally difficult. How could he fail to succeed?"

Another commentator says: "A difficult thing did not become difficult all at once; it is born of easy things, and, through the insensible accumulation of these, it becomes difficult. This is why he who plans difficult things, must begin with what is easy in them. Great things did not become great all at once. They began by being little, and, by gradual progression and growth, they became great. This is why he who desires to accomplish a great thing, must begin with what is little in it. The Saint never seeks to accomplish great things all at once; he is content to accumulate little things; this is why he comes to accomplish great things."

64. *What is at rest is easy to maintain; what has not yet appeared is easy to guard against; what is weak is easy to break; what is small is easy to scatter.*

Stop the evil before it exists; quiet the disorder before it arises.

A tree of mighty trunk springs from a root as thin as a hair; a tower nine stories high began in a handful of clay; a journey of a thousand miles began with one step.

He who is absorbed in action fails; he who attaches himself to anything loses it.

Therefore the Saint is not absorbed in action, and does not fail.

He attaches himself to nothing, and loses nothing.

When the men of the world undertake anything, it always fails at the moment of success.

Pay heed to the end as well as to the beginning, and you will never fail.

Therefore the Saint makes his desire consist in the absence of all desire. He does not long for possessions that are difficult to gain.

He is zealous to be free from zeal, and escapes the faults of other men.

He guards himself against becoming absorbed in work, in order that he may help all beings to follow out their law.

The words "what is at rest," says a commentator, indicate the time when no thought has yet been born in the heart, when joy or wrath have not yet shown themselves on the countenance, when the soul is perfectly serene and free from all emotion.

Regarding the simile of the tree, a commentator says: "This comparison shows that little things are the origin of great. If you wish to remove a tree, you must begin by tearing up the roots, otherwise it will grow again. If you wish to stop the flow of water, you must control the spring, otherwise it will flow anew. If you wish to end an evil, you must stop its source, otherwise it will burst forth once more."

Regarding a later sentence a commentator says: "When common men see that an undertaking is on the point of succeeding, they yield to negligence and levity; then the undertaking changes its face, and they fail completely. Be on the watch, therefore, at the end of your undertakings, as men are at the beginning; then you will be able to bring them to perfect accomplishment and will never fail."

Of the last sentence of the text a commentator says: "All beings have their proper nature. The men of the multitude do not follow the purity of their nature; they change themselves by giving themselves up to a disordered activity. They abandon candour and simplicity, to follow after cunning and astuteness; they give up what is easy and simple, to run after things arduous and complicated. In this they sin. The Saint sets himself to do the opposite."

65. *In antiquity, those who excelled in following the Way did not use it to enlighten the people; they used it to keep the people simple and ignorant.*

The people is hard to govern because it has too much astuteness.

He who makes use of astuteness to govern the kingdom, is the scourge of the kingdom.

He who does not use astuteness to govern the kingdom, brings happiness to the kingdom.

When a man knows these two things, he is the model.

To know how to be the model, is to be endowed with heavenly virtue.

This heavenly virtue is deep, measureless, opposed to creatures.

By it he succeeds in gaining wide-extended peace.

"When the people," says a commentator, "has not lost its simple and candid nature, it is easy to instruct and convert it; when the sincerity of its feelings has not been changed, it is easy to make it obey the laws. But as soon as it

has gained much astuteness, its purity and simplicity vanish, while craft and hypocrisy grow in it from day to day. If one should wish to teach the people the Way, and to make it adopt upright and orderly conduct, he will meet with immense difficulties. This is the reason why the wise men of antiquity sought to keep the people simple and ignorant, instead of enlightening it."

To put the matter in another way, the men of old thought that moral training should come before mental instruction.

66. *Why are the rivers and the seas able to be the lords of all waters?*

Because they know how to put themselves below them.

Because of this, they are able to become the lords of all waters.

So when the Saint wishes to rule the people, he must, by his words, put himself below the people.

When he desires to be placed in front of the people, he must put himself after the people.

So it comes that the Saint is set above the people, yet does not become a burden to the people; he is placed before all and the people suffers no hurt.

Thus all under heaven loves to serve him and does not weary of him.

As he does not claim precedence, there is none under heaven who can go before him.

"All the streams of the world," says the commentator, "enter the rivers and the seas, giving themselves up to them; this is why the rivers and the seas are the lords of all streams. How do they bring the streams to them? Only because they are below them."

One wonders whether, in those distant days, the people did in any general sense honour and obey the lowly and meek. It would seem to be the supreme sacrifice of the Masters, that, to help mankind, they must put themselves at the mercy of mankind; and mankind has as yet so little mercy.

67. *All the world says my path is lofty, yet I am as one of low degree.*

It is only because my path is mighty that I am as one of low degree.

As for the intelligent, their littleness has long been recognised.

I am the possessor of three precious things: I hold them and guard them as a treasure.

The first is called love; the second is called economy; the third is called humility, which forbids me to wish to be first under heaven.

I have love, and therefore I can be courageous.

I have economy, and therefore I can spend largely.

I dare not wish to be the first under heaven, therefore I can become the leader of all men.

But to-day they neglect love, to follow rashness; they neglect economy and spend largely; they neglect the lower place, to seek the higher place.

This path leads to death.

He who engages in warfare with a heart full of love gains the victory; if the city be guarded, it cannot be taken.

Whom Heaven would save, to him It gives love as a protection.

Perhaps the essence of this section may be summed up in the words: "He that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." The Greek word means the psychical life. He who hates the psychical, self-assertive principle in himself, guards his true life in the Eternal. This is a lofty path, yet he must be lowly who would tread it.

The three treasures are the reward of treading this path. Love is the life-breath of the Eternal, which breathes through the spiritual man, inspiring him with supreme courage to work for the purposes of the Eternal, and therefore to work courageously against the forces of self-assertion and self-seeking which seek to rob the Eternal. Economy is the wise use of all powers and resources, including the powers of the spiritual man; the right use of small efforts and small spaces of time. He who uses the moments for the Eternal, has time for much. He can spend and be spent for the purposes of the Eternal. Humility is to see oneself as being a part of the Eternal, having life only through the Eternal, seeking no purposes but the purposes of the Eternal. It is to burn up once for all the poisonous desire "to be the first under heaven," which is, whether avowed or not, the impulse of the lower self in every one; to surrender the heart utterly to the Eternal, in the spirit of reverent worship; and, in every thought and effort, to seek not self but the Eternal.

68. *The excellent leader of armies is free from the spirit of contention.*
The excellent warrior does not yield to wrath.
The excellent conqueror strives not.
The excellent leader of men puts himself below them.
This is called the possession of righteousness without contention.
This is called the wisdom to guide the powers of men
This is called union with Heaven.
Such was the sublime wisdom of the ancients.

It is once more a question of the spiritual man inspired by the life-breath of the Eternal. He works valiantly and unwearyingly for the purposes of the Eternal, yet he is free from the spirit of contention and wrath. He neither strives nor cries.

But, since the powers of the Eternal which inspire him dwell also in the hearts of other men, giving them all the life that they possess, he who understands and serves these forces can guide others into the way of righteousness.

69. *A warrior of the ancients has said:*
I dare not give the signal, as does the host; I had rather receive it, as does the guest.
I dare not advance an inch, I had rather withdraw a foot.

This is to have no rank to follow, no arm to stretch out, no enemy to pursue, no weapon to seize.

There is no greater error than to make light of the enemy.

To make light of the enemy is almost to lose our treasure.

Therefore, when two equally equipped armies meet, he who has the most love wins the victory.

According to one of the Chinese commentaries, this section is to be understood figuratively. It is intended to describe the humility and reserve of those who follow the Way.

Perhaps we shall be right, if we think of it as covering the same ground as certain sentences in *Light on the Path:* "Stand aside in the coming battle, and though thou fightest be not thou the warrior"; "seek the way by retreating within." The disciple is bidden to fasten the energies of the soul upon the task, the attitude opposite to making light of the determined and pitiless enemy. Carrying on the same thought, we may say that, in the conflict between the higher and lower nature, which is really a fight to the death, the higher nature wins because it has the greater love, love of the Eternal, as against self-love.

70. *My words are easy to understand, easy to carry out.*

In the world, none can understand them, none can carry them out.

My words have a source, my acts have a rule.

Men understand them not, and therefore know me not.

Those who understand me are few, yet am I the more honoured.

Therefore the Saint is plainly clad, and carries his jewels in his bosom.

The commentator says that the source of the Sage's words is the Way, that the rule of his acts is Righteousness, the practical following of the Way. Through the Way and Righteousness the Saint directs all the business of the kingdom, through them he clearly discerns success and failure, what is worthy of praise and what is worthy of blame; through them he distinguishes the portents of ill fortune and good fortune, of victory and defeat. Thus the Way is the source of his words, and Righteousness is the rule of his acts.

The last phrase in the text seems fairly paraphrased by the words: "That power which the disciple shall covet is that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men."

One of the Chinese commentators has this to say of it: "Inwardly, the Saint possesses sublime beauty; but, in his outward mien, he seems common and dull. He is like the oyster that hides a pearl under its rough shell; like the rude matrix that conceals a precious diamond. Therefore the herd cannot perceive his inner beauty or his hidden virtues."

C. J.

(To be concluded)

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME

THE Engineer had been criticizing the weather. He often does. He is particular about the weather. And it had been hideously hot. Then he remarked that in other respects also it had been a beastly day, full of chores devoid of interest and with nothing to show for them.

The Philosopher looked at the ceiling, "There are people," he said, "who insist that life is hell. All it means is that they have a hell of an attitude toward life!"

The Engineer was delighted. "I plead guilty," he declared. "And I am prepared to defend my thesis. We are *meant* to have a hell of an attitude toward life, if you insist upon using such language. The one thing that the high gods made sure of, when they first imagined the universe, was that it should be so ordered as to make contentment impossible. They foresaw that the only real danger confronting man was satisfaction with himself and his environment. That would have made progress impossible. So they invented duality as a condition of manifestation, and duality means hell and is intended to mean hell. The gods want men to be as miserable as possible, because it is the only way by which man can be induced to get up and try another spot. Bairnsfather did not only picture the war; he pictured what men call peace. His Bert and Old Alf shell-hole — 'Well, if you knows of a better 'ole, go to it' — was excruciatingly funny because it was so typical of life in general."

"Shut up! Talk sense!" the Student suddenly exclaimed. "I know that the Historian has something on his mind to say to us."

"And he shall, bless him," the Engineer countered. "But I must put *you* right first. You're at sea. 'Talk sense!' Let me ask you a question. Under the law of duality, a man must have the defects of his qualities. So must a woman. Now imagine two women. In appearance they are exactly alike. But one is an idealist who disapproves of you, and the other is in no sense an idealist who approves of you. Which of the two would you rather marry?"

"Theoretically," the Student answered, "I should prefer a woman who is an idealist and who approves of me!"

"Then you'll wait for ever, dear man, for reasons which I claim are obvious, and without any reflection upon you! The manifested universe is dual. You can't take it both going and coming. You may have your bitter sugar-coated, or you may have your bitter on the outside with the sugar in the centre to take the taste away. But there is no such thing in this world as a pill that is all sugar."

"I see," said the Student. "We may assume, therefore, that when you build a bridge you proceed on the theory that half the steel in it will be sound, and the other half full of blow holes and flaws. Consequently, half the bridge will stand and half will collapse. . . . I'd like a list of the bridges you have built."

"Children," said the Historian, "do you see that little bird on the tree over there? Come along with me and catch it! . . . But first, I should like to suggest certain propositions, by no means new — in fact, Emerson, Paracelsus, and most of the ancients, would have fathered all of them — but which seem to me to be worth reconsidering. Incidentally, they may throw some light on your discussion, if the absence of the *ad hominem* element will not distress you!

"These, then, are my propositions: (1) we are as we wish to be; (2) we do as we wish to do; (3) we get what we want; (4) we admire our faults.

"I want to determine the extent to which those propositions can be carried, — how far they hold true."

"'We are as we wish to be': then I am fat because I want to be! Is that your idea?" This from the Lawyer, with something between a groan and a jeer.

"You may want to be, in spite of what you think you want," replied the Historian. "You may be fat, or what you call fat, because you are so deeply indolent and comfort-loving that you desire an excuse for slow movement and also a protection against nerve shock! I do not know. But my propositions should have included fear as well as desire, as possible cause, for the reason that fear is a form of emotional attention, and attracts, therefore, just as surely as desire. In other words, you may be fat because for years you have been so mortally afraid of growing fat!"

"So far," said the Objector, "you have made me slightly dizzy, which is probably my fault. But on general principles I do like to have some idea of what a man is talking about. You are assuming that a man's body is made of ectoplasm?"

"No," the Historian rejoined. "I am assuming that a man's body is made of good, solid substance. Could anyone doubt that in the case of the Lawyer? But I was not thinking primarily of the physical body. It was the Lawyer himself who obtruded his. I was speaking of all the bodies, inner and outer, and of the personality as a whole, of mind, emotional nature and all the rest of it. You know, among other things, what St. Paul had to say about the spiritual body.

"As to my assumptions, they are: (1) that the Word, the Logos, the Idea, was made flesh, and always is and always will be made flesh; (2) that the ideas of which we are conscious are only a small fraction of the ideas which are perpetually at work in us, and that in many cases the motives which actuate us are entirely different from those which we choose, or are able, to recognize; (3) that the psychic activities of the mind, which govern the special level of the nervous system, govern therefore all the biochemical processes of the body, as well as the involuntary muscles, regulating the blood supply to any part of the body, controlling the output of the now popular ductless glands, and thus the chemical composition and the structural arrangement of the blood; (4) that most if not all organic diseases originate in functional disturbances or perversions, which in their turn are due to wrong nervous excitations or relaxations, which in their turn again are due invariably to psychic causes; (5) that while the

physical condition reacts upon the psychic condition — feeding its parent, as it were — the cause of the physical condition must always be sought in some moral or emotional irregularity of which the individual in most cases knows nothing, although he can and should know everything.

"Do you object to my assumptions?"

"I accept your first," the Objector answered. "That is easy, because I know nothing about the Logos and never expect to; and I have quantities of faith when I know nothing to discredit it! But your second: I take that to refer to the subconscious or unconscious mind. Am I right?"

"In part," said the Historian. "But the term, subconscious, is used almost exclusively to cover the motives and impulses which well up from below, — from the elemental world, and the world of inherent, 'bred-in-the-bone' instinct. As one writer puts it: 'The subconscious is a storehouse of the memories that have lapsed from the ordinary consciousness, of the wishes and sentiments that have been repressed, of the impressions of a distant past. But it is far from being inert, for it contains in addition the subsoil waters which are unceasingly at work; it contains the suggestions which will well up into the open after their hidden passage.'

"I accept all of that so far as it goes; but my second assumption includes also the great stream of spiritual suggestion and stimulation which reaches us perpetually from above, the spray from which occasionally penetrates our consciousness. Our present-day psychologists, being for the most part rank materialists, look for nothing and therefore can see nothing except that which wells up from below. Worse than that, they have transferred their idea of reality from the crude, objective 'matter' of the days of Buchner, to the instincts which embody 'the choices and decisions of the [lower] organisms whose lives prepared the way through eons of time for ours.' All our motives are supposed to spring from these instincts. As one of these ultra-modern writers says: 'The story of the life of man and the story of the mind of man must begin with the instincts.'"

"I suspect that is true of most men," interjected the Student.

"Doubtless it is. But what was the origin of the instincts? When and how did the first something develop the first appetite? They do not attempt to answer that question; they do not appear even to recognize it as a problem. Like 'that blessed word Mesopotamia', the word 'evolution' is supposed to explain everything and to produce everything. How or from what, does not concern them."

"But why should it concern them?" asked our Visitor suddenly. "Granting, as you seem to grant, that primitive instincts exist in all of us, what earthly difference does it make, where they came from?"

"This much of difference," the Historian replied; "a very earthly and a very practical difference: if you were to read chapter after chapter about the tremendous power of your animal instincts, described as the one great reality in life, and were told repeatedly that they account for all your motives, — you might be excused for wondering how anyone can hope to escape from such thral-

dom. If, next, you were told that there is a way of escape, but only one way, and that is to 'sublimate' these subterranean fires and threatening volcanoes by cultivating an interest in orphan asylums and other 'social' outlets, — you would be a phenomenon, in my opinion, if you felt equal to the task! 'Give me heaven or give me death,' has appealed only to the few, I admit; but 'give me my social outlet or give me death' — well, if you want it, you may have it!"

Our Visitor laughed. "Still," he said, "the instincts are there, and no one can deny their power. What do you suggest ought to be done with them?"

"Recognize them for what they are, in the first place; recognize their origin, their primal and present essence. Then, like Dante escaping from Hell, turn round and use them."

"How would you account for their origin?"

"How would you account for the origin of music?"

"That depends upon what you call music," said our Visitor. "The descent of much of our modern music could probably be traced back to the squeak of one primordial atom as it scraped against the edges of another."

"I am glad you saw my point," the Historian answered. "Can anyone seriously suppose that music, real music, has evolved from the chattering of apes! When will our psychologists and philosophers realize that 'every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights'!"

"Do you mean that the instincts came down from above?"

"I mean that the essence of that which manifests, in the animal kingdom, as an instinct, comes down from above."

"For instance?"

"The essence of each of the instincts, no matter how we may subdivide them, clearly is desire. Where does desire come from? My answer would be in the words of the *Rig Veda:* 'Desire first arose in It which was the primal germ of mind,' that is, in the Logos. This means that the essence or prime substance of each of the instincts, is spiritual and divine."

"For instance?"

"The three great instincts, which are referred to by most modern psychologists as paramount and as ultimate reality, are the self-preservation instinct, the reproductive or sex instinct, the social or herd instinct. You are aware, doubtless, that of these three, the herd instinct is supposed to rank as highest, so that the sermons of the future may be thought of as exhortations to be a good herder, to be a sociable animal.

"However, my point is that each of these instincts is a form of desire, and that if we would understand the nature of desire in itself, instead of as reflected in the lower kingdoms, we should study it, not in animals, still less in the perverted psychic nature of man, but in its manifestations on the plane of the spirit."

"How can we possibly do that?"

"Take the life and character of a great Master, such as Christ or Buddha. Can you not see in Christ a desire for infinite life, and a passionate desire to

give life to others, — immortal life, immortal consciousness? 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly'. Can you not see in him a passion of self-giving, even to 'the folly of the Cross'? Can you not see the divine shepherd of souls, — 'how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!' In the soul of each one of us, these divine desires still exist, uncontaminated. They are ours for the asking and using. That we are in physical bodies, and that these have inherited, from an infinitely distant past, the animal expression, or mode of manifestation, of divine attributes, — can no more affect the philosophical issue than can the psychic perversions given by man to animal instincts which, on their own plane, are natural and proper and 'pure'."

"I find it immensely difficult," said the Lawyer, "to believe in the intellectual honesty of materialists. Truth for its own sake, seems to be as far from their desire as it is from that of Irish Catholics and Christian Scientists. Even materialists must know, in theory at least, that —

'Tears from the depth of some divine despair
'Rise in the heart, and gather to the eyes,
'In looking on the happy autumn fields.'

"Yet, rather than see in such an experience the nostalgia of the soul, which would not fit in with their theories, they will explain it as some animal yearning for animal ends!"

"I have never understood, either," added the Student, "why they omit from their calculations, at the other pole — their own pole — the enormous power of inertia, of Tamas."

"Conceit," commented the Historian. "They like to think of themselves as discoverers. It would never occur to them that they could learn from the ancients; still less, that their 'discoveries' are the distorted re-statement of truths which the psychologists of antiquity had inherited from the Mystery teaching."

Our Visitor, at this point, harked back. "If the essence of instinct be desire," he said, "by what is desire controlled?"

"As I see it," said the Historian, "in order to answer that question, it is necessary to turn to first principles, and to think of desire or will, and of imagination, as inseparable aspects of Buddhi active, — of the spirit of man. It is said in the Purânas that Brahmâ was 'moved by the desire to create,' or to spend, to give himself. This supposes the imagination of something on which to spend himself; it supposes also the will to do so, because, on that plane, desire and will would be synonymous.

"Approaching the same problem from below, if we consider the formation of a physical habit, such as constantly putting the hand to the face, we may suppose that, in the first place, some insect annoyed us, and we moved our hand there with the desire to drive the insect away. Next, a speck of dust, or some impurity in the blood, causes a similar sensation, with the imagination — based upon association of ideas — of a fly or other insect as cause. The desire

to remove the supposed cause, produces the same action as before. Little by little, in this way, a habit is established in the organism itself, and the hand, apparently without immediate cause, is continually raised to the face. The habit is the outcome of a desire, originally legitimate, and of an imagination or fancy, — both many times repeated.

"Suppose, however, that a friend calls our attention to this bad habit, and that we resolve to cure ourselves of it. Only then, it seems to me, does the will become operative, for the will strives to impose its decision from above. On the spiritual plane, will and desire are one. On the lower planes, will and desire are frequently in conflict, — as the gods of antiquity, one in essence and origin, are often described as being at war."

"Now for a real question," said the Student. "Can we best overcome our bad habit by right will or by right imagination?"

"I defy you to use one without the other," the Historian answered. "Fancy can run riot, but the creative imagination, such as would be required, for instance, in the cure of a bad habit, can be evoked and maintained only by means of the will. On the other hand, it is impossible to will effectively without imagining the result to be produced."

"How do you reconcile what you have just said, with the well-known fact, so often cited by the advocates of auto-suggestion, that a man who is learning to ride a bicycle is almost certain to hit the stone which he desperately wills to avoid? The inference seems to be that in many cases the will defeats its own ends."

"Naturally," replied the Historian, "if you imagine defeat and fix your attention on defeat, you will not only head in that direction, but your will to avoid it must increase the fixity of your attention. It is like the oft-quoted case of the young monk who wills never to think about women, and who keeps on saying to himself, 'I will not think about women.' The result is that he thinks of nothing else! He is using his will negatively and not creatively. My own statement was that it is impossible to will effectively without imagining the result to be produced. The majority of people, and I suspect even most students of Theosophy, lay far too much emphasis on the will, and not nearly enough on the imagination. Yet Madame Blavatsky could not have been more explicit on this subject. It was in the first book she wrote, if I am not mistaken, that she declared: 'Every magical operation is based upon the right use of the imagination and the will.' It was in *Isis Unveiled* also that she quoted Paracelsus to the effect that 'faith must confirm the imagination, for faith establishes the will. . . . Determined will is a beginning of all magical operations. . . . Because men do not perfectly imagine and believe the result, is why the arts [of magic] are uncertain, while they might be perfectly certain.' Later, in *The Secret Doctrine*, she quoted the *Vishnu Purana* as follows: 'Brahma thought of himself as the father of the world.' Commenting on this, she called it the power of Kriya-shakti, adding in a foot-note: 'This *thinking of oneself* as this, that, or the other, is the chief factor in the production of every kind of psychic or even physical phenomenon.'

"Clearly, this 'thinking of oneself as this, that, or the other', can work for our undoing, just as easily as for our upbuilding. If it can create, it can also paralyse or destroy. It is a power so immense — if it created the world — that it would be folly not to study it."

"I agree with you there," said the Student. "I doubt if any of us begins to realize the importance of the imagination or the part it ought to play in spiritual progress. I believe literally that imagination makes the man. Our own experience ought to give us sufficient indication of its power, because, though we know little enough, I fear, of the kind of imagination which creates, we are victimized constantly by its psychic perversion, — by fancy, and by the kind of imagination which paralyses or destroys. The new Nancy School, as it is called, which bases everything upon auto-suggestion, has seen the value of, and constantly uses in support of its own theses, an illustration which I know was given by St. Thomas Aquinas, and probably by many others before him, to show the way in which our physical responses are controlled by our imagination. Place a board, two feet wide and thirty feet long, on a grass lawn, and anyone can walk along it; but place the same board between two spires of a cathedral, at a great height from the ground, and you know well, as they truly say, just how you would feel and just what would happen if you were to try to walk from one end of it to the other. In spite of your best endeavours, that is to say, in spite of your will, your imagination would run away with you, literally; and because you would so clearly imagine yourself falling, and because your clear imagination of this would arouse in you an overwhelming fear of falling, — your whole attention would be concentrated on the act of falling, and fall you would, inevitably."

"Quite so," the Historian replied, "but it seems evident to me that the new Nancy School goes too far when it infers from such an experience that the will is necessarily inferior to the imagination as a motive power. The imagination ought to be the servant of the will. It very rarely is. The majority of people are the slaves of their imagination."

"Strange," the Student commented, "that if a man loses control over his hands or feet, so that they shake or flap around in spite of him, he is likely to feel mortified, while he is not in the least ashamed if his imagination remains constantly beyond his control."

"Stranger still," added the Philosopher, "that so common an experience as a shaky hand does not suggest the right relation between will and imagination, for while I agree with the Historian that the imagination ought to be obedient to the will, I also agree with what he said earlier, namely, that both will and imagination are aspects of Buddhi active — of one and the same spiritual force — positive and negative the one to the other."

"Yes, and as always happens, when the force that ought to be negative is not controlled by the force that ought to be positive, so that the polarity becomes reversed, the force which ought to be positive, and creative at that pole, is turned into a destroyer by the 'introversion' of its own polarity. A feeble will, for that reason, is likely to increase the destructiveness of an uncontrolled imagination."

"But the shaky hand?" asked our Visitor.

"I meant that our own experience ought to show us that we can control it only by imagining steadiness, by imagining perfect control, — using will, first to evoke the imagination, and secondly to impose the resulting image upon the hand. If, instead of this, we rush at the hand, as it were, with a merely negative command not to shake, the probability is that the hand will shake more and not less. Our attention will be fixed on shaking, and not on steadiness."

We were intensely interested. Every one of us recognized the practical value of the discussion. Each one, probably, was thinking of his own problem, his own fight. So there was a pause. Then the Historian continued:

"The philosophy of modern investigators is not only based on premises that are fundamentally materialistic, but it is coloured throughout by the character of their research, which is confined almost entirely to abnormal and diseased conditions. It has been said of modern pathology that it knows nothing about health, and therefore very little about the recovery of health; for it works, mentally, not from health to disease and back from disease to health, but from disease to a condition, a goal, which is ill-determined at best, and which *mens sana in corpore sano* in no way makes definite. The same thing is true, I think, of most modern psychologists, many of whom, particularly the psycho-analysts, are little better than sex maniacs, seeing sex everywhere, and interpreting all things in terms of sex, or, to be more accurate, in terms of sex perversion. Those of them who escape that, none the less are inclined to see the universe in terms of some 'neurosis.'"

"All the same I think there is much to learn from some of the 'cases' they cite," the Lawyer urged. "Take, for instance, the case of the able-bodied man who woke one morning to find his arm behind his back, twisted there in some impossible position, from which neither he nor doctors could move it. There was nothing the matter with the arm itself. There was nothing the matter with the nerves as such. The condition was purely hysterical, by which I do not mean unreal, but due to subconscious association of ideas, connecting a recent experience with the deeply impressed image of an experience in youth. As soon as the psychic cause was discovered, by probing in the man's memory, and as soon as he recognized it as the cause, — he became able immediately to move his arm as usual."

"But what do you infer from that?" asked our Visitor.

"I infer that a power which uses a fool for his own undoing — a power great enough to twist and then paralyse a man's strong arm — should be used by those who are not fools for their own upbuilding, physically, mentally, morally. To read about such a case makes me feel ashamed that I cannot control the lightning!"

"You say there was nothing the matter with his nerves" — this from the Student. "I doubt if there ever is anything the matter with our nerves when the only symptom of the trouble is that we are 'nervous.' Diseases of the nerves are diseases, of course. But when I look into the state of my nerves — and my nerves spend most of the time screaming — I am forced to admit that

a morbid or uncontrolled imagination of some sort, can nearly always be found at the root of it. A man reports something to me, very slowly, with much detail, when I want to hear his story in ten words. At the end of ten minutes or sooner, my nerves are screaming so, that I am afraid he will hear them! Looking at it afterwards I find in many cases that the chief trouble was my own egotism, because I had wanted to talk instead of listening to him; but in other cases, when I had no desire to talk but only to attend to affairs which I considered more urgent than the subject which engrossed him, I find that my nerves would not have been affected in the least except for my having permitted myself to imagine, while he was talking, just how I should like him to make that report — with a celerity and precision of which I, of course, am incapable! — and to imagine, also, just what I should be doing if it were not for this intolerable interruption!"

All of us laughed. The experience was too painfully familiar. But the Student continued:

"I believe, however, that the most prolific cause of 'nerves' — which in time may become a nerve habit — is our imagination of evils that never arrive: I mean our dreads, our unpleasant anticipations. It is our duty to meet and talk with someone. We look forward to the interview. We imagine what the other person may do or say. In many cases we do this almost unconsciously. We imagine ourselves unequal to the situation. Our imagination arouses the emotion of dread, of fear. By violent effort of will we manage to control our nerves. But the imagination has the start and grinds on beneath the surface. Our effort of will exhausts us, as the trembling nerves resent and resist our pressure. The mischief is done. The whole trouble lies in the fact that, instead of having cultivated an automatic response which is based upon the benignancy of Life and its processes, we have allowed to grow up in us the habit of anticipating the painful and the disagreeable; our imaginations are ceaselessly at work destructively instead of constructively. Have you ever tried to imagine the nature and trend of a Master's imagination?"

"But it is the unknown that provides the element of dread," interjected the Philosopher, ignoring the Student's question. "If we force ourselves to face the thing or the situation we are afraid of, and to define exactly what it is that we fear, we shall find in most cases that the fear vanishes. It is because we so rarely do this, partly through false shame and partly through laziness, that fears of all kinds — inarticulate dreads and nervous anticipations — play so preponderant a rôle in our lives. Sometimes I think that fear is an unpardonable sin, like the sin against the Holy Ghost, because it amounts to a denial of the divine Spirit in ourselves and in life; and it undoubtedly cuts us off from consciousness of the Masters, so long as it lasts, very much as sin or as self-will cuts us off from them. The Historian quoted Madame Blavatsky on the subject of will and the imagination. Pages could be filled with quotations from her writings, and from such books as *Five Years of Theosophy*, about the paralysis caused by fear. Most of you have read *The Conquest of Fear*, by Basil King, a review of which, I understand, is to appear in the October issue of the

QUARTERLY. I enjoyed it immensely, and profited from it I hope. Yet everything he says and much more was given us over thirty years ago, in *Through the Gates of Gold*, — a book which still impresses me as one of the greatest ever written. 'Then the soul of man laughs in its strength and fearlessness, and goes forth into the world in which its actions are needed, and causes these actions to take place, without apprehension, alarm, fear, regret, or joy. . . . As a great artist paints his picture fearlessly and never committing any error which causes him regret, so the man who has formed his inner self deals with his life.' And again: 'Not only is man more than an animal because there is the god in him, but he is more than a god because there is the animal in him. . . . The god in man, degraded, is a thing unspeakable in its infamous power of production. The animal in man, elevated, is a thing unimaginable in its great powers of service and of strength.' *Light on the Path* epitomizes the same doctrine: 'Only he who is untamable, who cannot be dominated, who knows he has to play the lord over men, over facts, over all things save his own divinity, can arouse this faculty [of intuitive knowledge].' Above all, we were told, we must have the courage to search the recesses of our own nature 'without fear and without shame.'"

"When I was a small boy, I was afraid of the dark," our Visitor interjected, meditatively. "I remember, dimly, having overcome that fear by asking myself, when I was afraid to go into a dark room, whether it was burglars, or ghosts, or both! I then made myself go into the room for the specific purpose of locating the burglar, or the ghost, as the case might be. It worked. Perhaps, following the Philosopher's suggestion, this was because I got rid of the unknown, of the undefined, and made myself think only of the definite object which experience soon proved was never there! I think my mother put the idea in my head."

"It is time to adjourn," the Recorder announced.

"But we've only just begun," protested the Student. "What about the Historian's propositions? Are we to leave them up in the air?"

"And his assumptions?" added the Objector.

The Historian, instead of expressing disappointment, seemed rather pleased. "As a red herring," he said, "they served their purpose nobly: and think what I am saved! I have announced my propositions; I do not have to defend them. The Objector can boil over for three months. There may be others who will condescend, with me, to think about them!"

"Exactly so," the Objector retorted. "Many will think about them; very few will boil. Pots are plentiful; lids are scarce."

"To be continued in our next," the Recorder exclaimed hurriedly; and we adjourned.

T.

LETTERS TO STUDENTS

June 7th, 1908.

DEAR ———

* * * * * * * *

May I suggest one thought for you. Our organization has now been in active existence for nearly twenty years. No one in all that time has ever reached its limit. Indeed, those who have gone farthest are most insistent that there are no limits. The limit of possible development lies always with each individual. No matter how far you advance, you will find that it will still be able to hold out vistas of unscaled heights beyond.

Furthermore, I should like to suggest to you that this is a very real thing. Occultism, dealing as it does with fundamental principles, sometimes seems to a superficial observer as though it were too simple to amount to much. It insists upon the strict observance of ordinary moral and ethical laws, and at first we are a little inclined to say, "Why any Church teaches this. I did not suppose occultism was only this." But the laws of the spiritual world are exceedingly simple, so simple that most people pass them by entirely. Therefore I want to caution you against this frame of mind, and to say that success in occultism comes, not from obeying strange and recondite rules and laws, but by yielding implicit obedience to the few simple directions we are given. This latter course is very much the more difficult. The hard things in life are the little things of our daily existence; never to lose our tempers, never to be cross, never to be impatient, never to be rude or discourteous, in a word, never for a moment to forget that we are the soul, and to act every second of the day as we know the soul would act. This is real occultism. The manipulation of forces of nature and the acquirement of powers come as the result of this kind of training, and will not come until we show by our perfect obedience to this kind of training that we are fit to wield such powers.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that you should obey implicitly the few simple directions given you, the most important of which is the injunction about daily meditation. This should be strictly observed. You will not find it easy, but if you cannot do this little thing without fail, it is needless to say that you prove yourself unfit for harder rules and wider responsibilities. . . . I also suggest that you make a practice of reading something from a devotional book, such as *Light on the Path*, once or twice each day.

I shall be glad to hear from you at all times, and to answer to the best of my ability any questions you may have to ask. Fraternally,

C. A. GRISCOM.

August 2nd, 1908.

DEAR ———

I was much interested in your letter of July 16th, for it raises a point which almost every new member raises sooner or later, and that is the idea that it is

only possible to meditate when we are quiet and alone. It is perfectly true that it is easier to do so when alone, but it not only is possible to do so under all circumstances, but it is necessary that we shall learn how to do it under any circumstances. I think it will help if you will consider a mother who must be about her household work all day long, but who never for a moment forgets her child who is perhaps playing on the floor. She remembers the feeding hours, when to bathe it, and when to do the other things which every infant needs. Her thought of the child is a sort of brooding care which hovers over it every second of the day and night, for even when she sleeps she always remembers it, and is awake in a second at any unusual movement or cry.

Meditation is much more like this undercurrent of feeling, this constant unremitting consciousness, than it is like any definite thought; so you will see that it is perfectly possible to have it always, no matter what the hands and brain may be busy with. We must try to learn to keep the Master and the ideals which we have, always in the background of our minds, just as the mother keeps her child; we must try to learn to act always, in every detail of our lives, with this consciousness and these ideals forming the basis of each action; we should try to learn to do everything as if the Master himself were watching us every second of the day, — as indeed he is, for no act or thought of ours escapes his observation.

You see that in the higher sense solitude and quiet are not at all necessary for meditation, although they are both very desirable, and both help to make the learning of this difficult practice much easier.

You speak of the difficulty of restraining your temper. Do not you see how this practice of continuous meditation would help you there? You would not dare give way to a hasty temper, or make a cutting or rude remark, if you felt at the moment, as you should feel, that a member of the Lodge was watching you and saw everything you did. Cannot you see how a very little of this practice would work a revolution in our characters? We simply could not help but become gentler and kinder and more serene and patient, — not to speak of the more active and more striking virtues. It is, in fact, this sort of subtile undercurrent of thought and prayer and meditation, which can work the necessary revolution in our characters.

I shall be glad to hear from you at any time.

Fraternally,
C. A. Griscom.

October 25th, 1908.

Dear ———

I was very glad to have had the pleasure of meeting you last night and I am sorry that we had no opportunity to talk, but it would have been impossible to have referred to personal matters at such a meeting.

I think you would be wise to stop thinking of your faults. We can never cure a fault by thinking about it and dwelling upon it. Our minds become full of it, and consequently we commit the fault almost automatically whenever

there is an opportunity to do so. *Think of the opposite virtue and dwell upon that.* If you are troubled with impatience do not say, "Now I must conquer my impatience, I must not let my impatience express itself," etc. But, on the contrary, say to yourself, "I must be patient, I must cultivate patience." Dwell upon the virtue of patience and insist that your mind shall be full of the idea and the ideal of patience. So with all your other faults. There is always a virtue which is the opposite of each fault, and if you will cultivate the virtue you will find the fault disappearing without your having to fight it at all. It will simply shrivel up.

How can we fear darkness, or anything else, if we believe that we are in the care of the Masters, that we are protégés of the great Lodge? It is said that some member of the Lodge is watching us all every second of the day and night, that we are never for a single instant without protection and guidance, and if this be so, then fear of any kind is a lack of faith and a weakness which we must get rid of, and we should use the same means to get rid of it as I have already described. Do not try to fight your fear. Ignore it, and force yourself to think of faith, of your reliance upon the Masters, upon your certainty that they are watching and helping you, and that it would be inconceivable for them to let anything harmful happen to you. Think of the universe as a sea of Light, an ocean of spiritual force, upon which you rest at all times, the darkness being but a Maya, a film between your eyes and this sea of Light, which can disappear at any time.

In other words, be positive towards all these things, not negative. Look always upon the positive side of life, upon the virtues, the force, the life, the light, the faith; not upon the negative aspect of these things which are all of them but the temporary creations of our lower personalities, and which will all of them disappear.

I shall be glad to hear from you again, and hope you will write soon.

Sincerely,

C. A. GRISCOM.

December 5th, 1908.

DEAR ———

I have your two letters, and I am sorry that press of work has prevented my replying to them sooner.

The six glorious virtues spoken of in the *Voice* are the Buddhic Paramitas, the transcendental Virtues. There are six for the people and ten for the priests. I cannot find the names of the six, but the ten for priests are as follows:

1. Generosity.
2. Kindness.
3. Renunciation.
4. Wisdom.
5. Resolution.
6. Patience.
7. Love of Truth.
8. Energy.
9. Goodwill.
10. Equanimity.

They are a pretty fine set of qualities and I do not think we should make any mistake in trying to follow them.

I was interested in your comments upon the suggestions in my letters. Of course you understand they are not my ideas, but are the ideas of those who have been teaching for millenniums.

You should try to do things for other people, even if all you can do is to be kind, and to say encouraging and sympathetic things. You can do something for everyone you meet if you keep this in mind. Doing things for people does not necessarily mean doing some kind of physical work, or intellectual work. More people are hungering for spiritual alms than for physical bread. Try to cultivate the spirit of service, the desire to help others, and you will find abundant opportunities.

I am always glad to receive your letters.

Fraternally,

C. A. GRISCOM.

November 29th, 1909.

DEAR ———

Have you read and studied Mr. Mitchell's pamphlet on Meditation? He shows more clearly than any other writer just what meditation really is, and what we should try to make it. I think if you were to read it you would find an answer to your query in the last letter you wrote me.

Meditation is not thought. We can sit quietly *thinking* of some point in the teaching, and this is worth while, but meditation is more than this; it is the activity of the inner mind which takes place when ordinary thought has ceased. The higher mind cannot function while the lower mind (our usual mind) is active, and meditation is the name given to the process whereby we still the lower mind and give the higher mind a chance to work. It is very difficult and requires a long training and effort, — constantly repeated effort, because it is a process which goes contrary to the ordinary heredity and habit of our brains. But it can be done. Many have succeeded, so no matter how long it takes or how hard it is, you must not be discouraged.

The sentence you quote, about offering up our acts daily, has, I suppose, a different meaning for each person. It means, perhaps, that we should always act as if we were the agent of the Master on whose ray we are, and as if we did whatever we did because we were his servant, doing his work. If we have this thought in our mind we are not likely to do wrong.

With kindest regards,

I am sincerely,

C. A. GRISCOM.

April 17th, 1910.

DEAR ———

* * * * * * * *

Is there nothing I can do to help you? Is everything in connection with your studies and your life going along so smoothly that you have no questions,

no doubts, no misunderstandings? Surely there must be somewhere and somehow that I could help you.

I do not wish to be importunate, but I do want you to be sure that I am always at your service.

Fraternally,

C. A. GRISCOM.

May 29th, 1910.

DEAR ———

I was pleased to have your letter. I am afraid that the trouble about our correspondence is that I have been unable to do or say anything of interest to you. There must be many problems which confront you as you go onward through life. Life is not so simple and easy that we can live it from day to day, always knowing our duty, always understanding what is required of us, always equal to the demands made upon us, and whenever we get into one of these situations where we feel ourselves unequal to our task, we should turn to the Lodge and our associates in the Movement for help; in your case you have at least the right to ask questions of me. I am a very weak reed to lean upon, I grant you, but fortunately I have back of me all the power and knowledge of our Movement, so that you do not really depend upon me, but use me simply as an instrument to tap the real reservoir which lies back of me.

The Test . . . is a test which meets us every day of our lives and many times a day. It is whether we live consistently from the point of view of the Soul, or whether we guide our actions according to worldly standards. It is only a version of the old saying that we cannot serve both God and Mammon. We must throw our weight upon the side of what is divine in us, or on the side of the personality. This test goes on endlessly until the spiritual side becomes so much our second nature, as the phrase has it, that it ceases to be a test and we become divine, because we always act as divine beings act. The whole purpose of our training is to aid this struggle between our higher and our lower selves.

I do not feel that you lack any understanding of these things, or I would have tried harder than I have to keep up a more frequent correspondence with you.

* * * * * * * *

With kindest regards and best wishes,

I am sincerely,

C. A. GRISCOM.

July 10th, 1910.

DEAR ———

You must not think I was blaming myself for your short-comings. I have no right to assume or even to suppose that you have any. I was blaming myself because I had been able to do so little for you. This is absolutely my fault, not yours. You are yourself and it is my duty to help you just as you are.

It is good of you to say that I have helped you, but I am afraid I have done very little. I certainly have not done what I should have liked to have done.

* * * * * * * *

With kindest regards and best wishes,

I am sincerely,

C. A. GRISCOM.

September 17th, 1910.

DEAR ———

I have had to delay reply to your last letter owing to the press of work which has kept me in town all summer.

The confusion about Mars and Mercury and the point you mention dates back a long time, and raised a controversy in the early days of the Society which is quite famous. If you will look up the old numbers of *The Path* you will find a series of articles by Mr. Judge and Mr. Sinnett on the subject.

Briefly, Mr. Sinnett was wrong and he wrote from a misunderstanding. Any planet which we can see is on the same plane as our own Earth and belongs to some other chain. It would be the fourth globe of that other chain. The Moon is the remnant of a fourth plane globe which belonged to a previous era. There is an intimate connection between it and the Earth because the Earth became heir to the power and force which once made the Moon an active globe.

I hope this is clear. I also hope you had a pleasant summer and a good rest.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

C. A. GRISCOM.

May 5th, 1911.

DEAR ———

Your letter of April 30th pleased me very much indeed, for the greatest compensation we can have is the consciousness that we have been of help to another. It was kind of you to think of writing about it.

* * * * * * * *

It is always possible to do more than we are doing. For one thing, we can formulate a deliberate and conscious ideal in our minds, instead of having just a vague hope and desire that we may advance spiritually. You say that you would like to attain the power of receiving the teaching of the Master face to face. All right: that is a wonderful thing to strive for. It is entirely possible for you to do it if you will make it the purpose of your life. It is not possible if it is only one of several contradictory things which you are trying to do.

The sentence that the Kingdom of Heaven must be taken by violence means that it takes more than a general vague desire to enter the spiritual world. It takes all the energy and power and will of a determined nature, roused to its fullest expression by love of the Master, to force a way into the inner world.

Remember too, that we must give to others what we have in turn received

for ourselves. The inner nature soon becomes stagnant if the current only runs in. It must also run out.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

I am sincerely,

C. A. GRISCOM.

September 27th, 1914.

DEAR ———

You ask a question as old as the hills, "Why don't we want to be good?" A part of us does want to be, and knows we ought to be, and knows, moreover, that it *pays* to be good. But there is another part of us, the side of self-indulgence and self-will, which does not want to surrender its life, for it knows that surrender means death. So the eternal contest goes on in each one of us until the side of the angels wins and the other side is thrust away and "downed" once and for all. It must be done many many times in an incomplete manner before we learn how to do it completely. That means a long course of self-repression, of self-conquest, of self-denial, — of discipline. We know this, and start bravely enough on such a course, but before long we get slack and relax and our efforts become fruitless. That is the reason why a Rule of Life is so necessary. We must have the aid of a mechanical habit in order to continue to behave properly when we no longer want to, and no longer are willing to try. A Rule of Life carries us over these dry periods. But it must be a Rule that covers the details of our lives, not the vague general direction. It must regulate when we get up, when we meditate and for how long; when and what we eat; when and how we work; when we can take an hour for recreation and rest; when we pray and when we go to bed.

Such a Rule of Life should be made by each one, for himself, according to his individual circumstances, and should not be too rigid or too hard; for once adopted it must be kept perfectly, unless for adequate reason, or harm will result.

The effort to keep such a Rule tends to keep us constantly inspired, constantly up to our best, and the habit of keeping it when formed, helps us over the arid and desolate and depressing places we all live through. In due time, if we are faithful, our hearts will catch fire and we shall go forward on wings instead of on our hands and knees.

With kind regards,

I am sincerely,

C. A. GRISCOM.

The Spirit: The Relation of God and Man, Considered from the Standpoint of Recent Philosophy and Science; edited by Canon B. H. Streeter, M.A. (Macmillan, 1921, $2.25).

This notable collection of essays is one of a series under the same able editor, the earlier volumes of which were entitled *Foundations*, *Concerning Prayer*, and *Immortality*. The effort has been to obtain specially equipped writers who should concentrate each on one phase of some question of moment in the religious thought of to-day, recasting, as it were, old religious dogmas and traditions in the light, and in the terms of, modern science — including psychology and psycho-therapy. The ten essays on *The Spirit* here under review, are an index of the modern mind — the modern religious mind — and are a hopeful sign of the times. It is not only that they are ably written (those by Mr. Clutton-Brock brilliantly so), and that they are all stimulating and provocative ("The Psychology of Power" by Captain Hadfield, an expert neurologist with "advanced" views, is almost irritating), but that there is throughout so genuine a quest for truth, combined with such unusual and comprehensive tolerance, that members of the Society will recognize a kindred spirit, and must inevitably seek to encourage and to co-operate. "The Church's attitude towards truth," writes the editor truly, "has been a *moral*, not an intellectual, failure. . . . Nothing is nobler than the impulse which moves man to offer up his best and dearest to his God, nothing more pathetic than the delusion that he must first slay the thing he offers — whether it be his first-born in the flames of Moloch or his reason at the altar of Christ" (p. 358).

Two of the writers, Miss Lily Dougal and Mr. A. Clutton-Brock, who contribute each two papers, have already received notice among the reviews of the QUARTERLY. Miss Dougal is an earnest advocate of fearless and unbiased as well as clear thinking. Believing that common sense is the basis of any religious tenet, she surveys and defines such terms as the "supernatural," and offers a tentative and not wholly satisfactory discussion of "religious experience in the light thrown upon it by psychology." Religious experience as presented by her, is limited to its crudest and most elementary forms, and she seems to distrust the whole range of higher experience. Her paper on "The Language of the Soul," with analysis of the sacraments, seems philosophically sound, and as between Protestant and Catholic, attempts to be impartial; but we regret a total misapprehension of the needs of ignorant people ("hasty genuflexions are ignoble and absurd" [p. 269]), and of the traditional secrecy of the genuine rituals of the ancient schools — "The paraphernalia of a mystery-religion may be a necessary relief from a hideous world, but at the best it can only be a temporary expedient, suffered until Christianity is vital enough to transform the work-a-day world" (p. 268).

Mr. Clutton-Brock's article on "Spiritual Experience" is the most brilliantly written and artistic essay by this gifted writer, yet read by the reviewer. It is artistic, because of what is conveyed and suggested, where exposition, however lucid, would be inadequate. He pleads that æsthetic experience, which is man's first introduction to spiritual experience, is the complement of the scientific in that "we are aware of something personal." "Those who do not believe that personality is real, do not believe that life is real" (p. 340). His emphasis on the absolute need for a recognition of the personal in the spiritual world is distinctly refreshing, when myths are considered absurd by science, "artistic activity . . . mere trifling however pretty its products," and when modern students of the mystics, such as

Evelyn Underhill, attempt to discredit or explain away the personal experience testified to by all mystics. He pleads for the "fairy angel" in all nature and all life, and he insists that God is supremely alluring,—not only the devil and his minions: "If He exists at all, the uttermost beauty, the most extreme enchantment, must be His; He cannot have left it to a dangerous fairy or to obviously sinful artists" (p. 285). "We think we are more religious than the pagans, but most of us are less, because out of fear we deny this personal quality in nature and impoverish our own concept of God." One is tempted to quote repeatedly from this one essay: — "It is the aim of religion to free us from loneliness, to make us aware of a universe in which there are not merely things and processes and functions, but everywhere person answering to ourselves; and our religion [*id est* "churchianity"] fails to do that more and more because the fairy angel is left out of it, left to the poets, who therefore are not religious" (p. 286). "St. Francis tried to bring that music into our religion; but we think him quaint, odd, even a little mad" (p. 292). "Spiritual experience is of such a nature that it is not consummated until it is shared" (p. 296, cf. p. 341). "All art is the presentment in some form or other of that which, in reality, has produced religious experience" (p. 298). A second essay, "Spirit and Matter," provides an excellent critique of the materialistic view so predominant in scientific writers of the last fifty years.

In the space of one review it is impossible even to summarize the several remaining essays, all of which without exception are worth reading. "The Psychology of Grace" by the Rev. C. W. Emmet, contains an excellent exposition of the modern opinions about grace, which will perhaps be novel to most orthodox readers. Members of the Society cannot fail to find in this book not merely an illustration of the theosophic method applied with notable success, but information which will parallel much of the teaching we know as specifically theosophical.

A. G.

The Conquest of Fear, by Basil King (Doubleday, Page and Company, 1922; $2.00).

This is one of the most valuable and inspiring books we have read for some time. We advise all students of Theosophy to read it and to re-read it. Every one of us needs to be saturated with its philosophy. We do not mean that it should be accepted without discriminating reflection. Use discrimination always, as Mr. Judge said. Up to a certain point, a student of Theosophy will find himself not only in accord, but in enthusiastic accord, with the author's thesis. Later in the book, it becomes evident that, for lack of Theosophy, the author has failed to solve, even to his own satisfaction, some of the problems with which he finds himself confronted. Unusually logical up to that point, he seems to stagger, intellectually, when he reaches it. His attitude toward death is unsatisfactory, for this reason. An understanding of reincarnation would provide him with one of the elements which his thinking omits. But Theosophy — the real Theosophy — would provide him with more than that.

In form, the book is autobiographical. Not much reading between the lines is necessary to see in it the record of an heroic struggle and a great achievement, which adds considerably to the interest and appeal of its teaching. Nothing would be gained, but much lost, by attempting to give a précis of its contents. The best we can do is to indicate the character of the book by quoting at random from its pages: —

"To me it seems basic to the getting rid of fear to know that our trials, of whatever nature, are not motiveless. In our present stage of development we could hardly do without them. So often looking like mere ugly excrescences on life they are in reality the branches by which we catch on and climb. They are not obstacles to happiness for the reason that the only satisfying happiness we are equal to as yet is that of wrestling with the difficult and overcoming it. Every call of duty has its place in this ideal, every irksome job, every wearisome responsibility. The fact that we are not always aware of it in no way annuls the other fact that it is so. Boredom, monotony, drudgery, bereavement, loneliness, all the clamour of unsatisfied ambitions and aching sensibilities, have their share in this divine yearning of the spirit to grasp what as yet is beyond its reach. All of that hacking of the man to fit the job rather than the shaping of the job to fit the man, which is, I imagine, the source of most of the discontent on earth, has

its place here, as well as the hundreds of things we shouldn't do if we were not compelled to. Whatever summons us to conflict summons us to life, and life, as we learn from a glance at the past, never shirks the challenge."

"It is an axiom in all progress that the more we conquer the more easily we conquer. We form a habit of conquering as insistent as any other habit. Victory becomes, to some degree, a state of mind. Knowing ourselves superior to the anxieties, troubles, and worries which obsess us, we *are* superior. It is a question of attitude in confronting them. It is more mental than it is material. To be in harmony with the life-principle and the conquest-principle is to be in harmony with power; and to be in harmony with power is to be strong as a matter of course."

"God has never, as far as we can see, dealt in special and temporary gifts. He helps us to see those we possess already. What our Lord seems anxious to make clear is the power over evil with which the human being is always endowed. It is probably to be one of our great future discoveries that in no case shall anything do us harm. As yet we scarcely believe it. Only an individual here and there sees that freedom and domination must belong to us. But, if I read the signs of the times aright, the rest of us are slowly coming to the same conclusion. We are less scornful of spiritual power than we were even a few years ago. The cocksure scientific which in its time was not a whit less arrogant than the cocksure ecclesiastical is giving place to a consciousness that man is the master of many things of which he was once supposed to be the slave. In proportion as the wiser among us are able to corroborate that which we simpler ones feel by a sixth or seventh sense, a long step will be taken toward the immunity from suffering which our Lord knew to be ideally our inheritance."

"To expect less is to get less, since it is to dwarf my own power of receiving. If I close the opening through which abundance flows it cannot be strange if I shut abundance out."

And then, in conclusion:

"That mystic resistless force [the 'life-principle'], which has fashioned already so many forms, is forever at work fashioning a higher type of man. Each one of us is that higher type of man potentially. Though we can forge but little ahead of our time and generation, it is much to know that the Holy Ghost of Life is our animating breath, pushing us on to the overcoming of all obstacles. For me as an individual it is a support to feel that the principle which was never yet defeated is my principle, and that whatever the task of to-day or to-morrow I have the ability to perform it well. The hesitation that may seize me, or the questioning which for an instant may shake my faith, is but a reminder that the life-principle is not only with me, but more abundantly with me in proportion to my need. My need is its call. The spasm of fear which crosses my heart summons it to my aid. It not only never deserts me, but it never delays, and is never at a loss for some new ingenuity to meet new requirements. 'From strength to strength' is its law, carrying me on with the impetus of its own mounting toward God."

E. T. H.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION NO. 271. — *How can I take the first step in persuading myself of the existence of God? I wish I could gain some measure of faith, — drifting about is so unsatisfactory.*

ANSWER. — Some people hypnotize themselves into scepticism. They make up their minds that they cannot believe. Automatically, therefore, they lose the power. But if they were to lose the use of one of their arms, they certainly would not brag about it. Why brag, as a few do, about loss of faith? Faith is at least as important among the faculties as will or intellect, and much more valuable than an arm. Further, the very people who say they have none, use it all the time. It requires enormous faith either to leave one's house, or to stay in it, in a city like New York! To go to sleep, to travel in a subway, to accept a friendship, to cross a street, — all these and innumerable other commonplace acts, involve terrific faith. And, closely analysed, all of them are based upon a belief in God. People do not recognize faith when they use it. (For that matter, they rarely recognize imagination, when they use that.) So the answer is, — Watch yourself, and think! If you have any good impulses, where do they come from? You will never find God outside of yourself, until you have found God within yourself.

H.

ANSWER. — The questioner has mistaken the difficulty. The difficulty does not lie in believing in God: it lies in believing in anything besides God.

Y.

QUESTION NO. 272. — *What is the true function of Science, and what is its proper relation to Religion?*

ANSWER. — Science means to me knowledge and understanding of the working of the Cosmos and its parts. It might be said that Science broadens the view and scope of Religion; nevertheless the two are mutually dependent. Religion separated from Science is small and narrow. Science separated from Religion is a force without a goal.

C.

ANSWER. — The function of Science is to observe and collect the facts of natural processes. These observed facts can be compared, and repeated occurrences permit us to say that nature works according to certain invariable methods. Each such method may then be called a law of nature in its manifestation. The observation and record of such laws may be called the body of Science, and this body is subject to gradual changes which have to be further observed, just as the body of man undergoes changes, even though the main principles of action remain unchanged and unchanging. But men who have devoted themselves to scientific observation, have in many cases claimed for Science that there is nothing to be observed beyond the behaviour of particles of matter in relation to each other, and that the laws of matter are the sole laws of nature. With such instruments of observation as they have had, they have narrowed the sphere of their observation. But the discovery of X-rays and of radium, with the increased knowledge of matter and the relation of atoms and electrons, has widened the sphere of observation so that material science has entered the domain of the immaterial, perforce. Now it is in the domain of the immaterial that Religion has its place, so to say. Religion essentially means the laws of the soul, the laws of a something which is akin to, but of a higher order than, the body and its laws, just as the mind of the artist who creates a picture is of a higher order than the hand which paints it. True Science and true Religion are really one in essence, while

the working out of their effects in manifested life as ordinarily observed, varies according to the observer and the form which either takes. A. K.

ANSWER. — Probably every one of us who has been helped by *Light on the Path* will turn at once to its First Comment, in seeking our own answer to this interesting question. There we find: "Knowledge is man's greatest inheritance; why, then, should he not attempt to reach it by every possible road? The laboratory is not the only ground for experiment. *Science*, we must remember, is derived from *sciens*, present participle of *scire*, 'to know,' — its origin is similar to that of the word 'discern,' 'to ken'."

So far the most materialistic of scientists will agree with us, but there is a challenge in what follows: "Science does not therefore deal only with matter, no, not even its subtlest and obscurest forms. Such an idea is born merely of the idle spirit of the age. Science is a word which covers all forms of knowledge. It is exceedingly interesting to hear what chemists discover, and to see them finding their way through the densities of matter to its finer forms; but there are other kinds of knowledge than this, and it is not everyone who restricts his [strictly scientific] desire for knowledge to experiments which are capable of being tested by the physical senses."

Science, therefore, might be considered as a witness to the truth. Unfortunately, too often modern Science has refused to take the complete oath of the witness "to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God." Perhaps it is because many scientists are inclined to disregard the possibility of God's helping us that they have found it difficult to push forward to a point where their testimony as to the truth would mean the telling of the whole truth. If Science really be a means of acquiring knowledge, in this sense Religion might be considered as the application of the knowledge acquired through scientific investigation. The true function of Science in regard to Religion might be considered as the means of establishing the facts of one's relations with others, and with the universe, so as to enable one to live helpfully toward others, and in harmony with the universe.

G. W.

ANSWER. — Science is the knowledge of Nature. Only there are seven aspects of Nature, seven "Prakritis" in the ancient metaphysics, and no science is true to its purpose if it confine its observations and inductions to the lowest and most material of these aspects. Religion is literally that which "binds together." It is the expression of the ideal of human brotherhood, when all souls will have become one in the Over-Soul. Science and Religion would be related, then, as means and end, as knowledge and action. Without a religious or philanthropic purpose, Science becomes a mere monotonous tabulating of facts, interspersed with hypotheses about things of no significance. Without a basis of Science or sure knowledge, Religion becomes sentimentality or fanaticism, which has been well defined as "the redoubling of one's effort, when one has forgotten one's aim."

S. L.

ANSWER. — Science, which in essence means simply "knowledge" or "to take knowledge," must be the inevitable handmaid of Religion: Religion here used in a sense akin to "theology" which in its original signification was "the word of God," the unfolding of the whole of God's universe. No amount of sheer knowledge, no mere accumulation of information, of facts, will ever produce wisdom. Religion, in the widest sense, seeks to combine an accurate record and ordering of the facts of the universe, together with a discipline of the individual life, in such a way as to expand the individual capacity to a degree of instinctive sagacity which (relatively speaking) may be denominated wisdom. (Ultimate wisdom is beyond our powers of conception, and is illimitable.) The accumulation of facts apart from the discipline of life leads either to endless ratiocination, or to knowledge and power on merely the lower planes of life, with a dangerous divorce from all those laws of spiritual development and growth which depend upon moral hygiene and trained spiritual perception, and which are alone potent to control and direct the "power" of knowledge. In contrast with wisdom, the acquirement of knowledge has definite limits. It is, however, because Science does seek real facts, does seek the truth,

that it has power and deals with realities and real forces. It accomplishes results. But because the Science of our generation has limited its field of vision and of research, because it concerns itself not at all with the moral life and spiritual growth of the individual student, the vast body of scientific attainments of the day have as a net result jeopardized the welfare of humanity, corrupting it with luxuries and indulgences, and have placed at the command of absolutely untried and undisciplined men a degree of knowledge which is highly dangerous. Science as it is to-day, and the power which Science has generated and put into the hands and minds of men, must be redeemed, or it will destroy itself. It can only be redeemed by a more consistent and faithful adherence to its primary principle of a genuine quest of truth. If Science to-day can be brought to a realization of its narrowness and dogmatism — if it can be persuaded to see what Religion has already learned, that knowledge cannot be divorced from life, and that each man must live the life to know the doctrine — then Science can and may indeed serve humanity well, in making easy for it an understanding of the laws of the universe, and of the grandeur of life itself. Without Science (in its largest sense), Religion would tend towards unnatural asceticism; without Religion, Science is either sterile, or a dangerous derelict. At best, Science must subserve Religion, which is the larger term, for true Science is an activity of the religious life.

M. H.

ANSWER. — The fundamental aim of true Science as well as of true Religion is to know the truth. In the Golden Age, therefore, any distinction between them would be maintained only as a matter of convenience. The so-called "conflict" between Religion and Science is possible only where one or both fall short of being ideal. Knowledge of truth may be regarded as dependent upon the accumulation of facts. It is obvious, however, that the mere accumulation of facts is fruitless, unless the knowledge gained be applied to the advantage of humanity. This is one of the ways in which present-day Science is at fault. It has not concerned itself with the application of knowledge to the spiritual well-being of humanity, whereas present-day Religion does most emphatically attempt to make such an application. This distinction is of far-reaching importance, as knowledge can be used just as readily by the Black Lodge as the White. From this point of view, present-day Religion is perhaps at fault in paying too little attention to facts. Religion, at any given stage, tends to become dogmatic, to develop a theology, becoming formal and sterile, in which case any real desire to know the truth disappears. At this point it ceases to appeal, at least to intelligent people; and the knowledge meanwhile acquired by Science, given to the world without any sense of spiritual responsibility, inevitably leads to an era of materialism, of luxury, and finally to the ruin of a civilization. This sequence fairly enough epitomizes the history of all the great civilizations. It should be stated here that it is an idle boast to regard Science as a peculiar product of our own civilization. Its equivalent has always existed, and has contributed liberally to the ruin of every past civilization.

It will be seen, therefore, that the "materialism" of Science is really at the root of the evil, as dogmatism and its consequences certainly cannot be regarded as an evil peculiarly inherent in Religion. The materialism of present-day Science is due to two causes. First, it was forced to combat in its infancy a strongly intrenched dogmatic theology, masquerading as Religion, and it thus acquired an initial prejudice against Religion, now only partially outgrown. Its only available weapon in this conflict was the accumulation of facts, which plainly proved the folly of some of the theology. Scientific research, consequently, early crystallised around such phenomena as could be readily observed, studied or experimented with, obviously physical or material phenomena. It is patent that with such methods of research, which have become traditional, it will take a long time before Science perfects instruments sufficiently sensitive to discover the spiritual world! Only with this discovery can a sense of the spiritual responsibility of those possessing knowledge be quickened into life.

When Science has ceased to be materialistic, when the truths it discovers can properly become the theology of a Religion which applies that knowledge for the spiritual welfare of humanity, then and then only will it be possible to define the true functions of the former and its proper relation to the latter.

BIOLOGIST.

STANDARD BOOKS

Blavatsky, H. P. Five Years of Theosophy	cloth,	$2.50
Key to Theosophy	cloth,	2.50
Secret Doctrine, The, Vols. I and II and Index	cloth,	
Theosophical Glossary	cloth,	3.00
Voice of the Silence	cloth, .85; leather,	1.50
Cavé. Fragments, Volume I	boards,	1.00
Volume II	boards,	1.00
Hillard, Katherine. Abridgment of the Secret Doctrine	cloth,	3.00
Primer of Theosophy, A	paper,	.05
Johnston, Charles. Bhagavad Gita	Translated, annotated; cloth,	1.25
	limp leather, India paper,	1.75
From the Upanishads	paper,	.50
Parables of the Kingdom, The	paper,	.50
Patanjali's Yoga Sutras	Translated, annotated; cloth, India paper,	1.25
Song of Life, The	paper,	.75
Judge, William Q. Bhagavad Gita	Edited; cloth, .85; leather,	1.00
Culture of Concentration	paper,	.10
Letters That Have Helped Me, Volume I	cloth,	1.00
Volume II	cloth,	1.00
Ocean of Theosophy	cloth,	1.10
Keightley, Archibald. Spiritual Life, The	paper,	.20
Theosophy as an Influence in Life	paper,	.20
Mitchell, Henry Bedinger. Meditation	paper,	.30
Talks on Religion	cloth,	1.50
Theosophical Society and Theosophy, The	paper,	.20
Sinnett, A. P. Esoteric Buddhism	cloth,	2.00
Occult World, The	cloth,	2.00
Walker, E. D. Reincarnation	cloth,	1.75
Idyll of the White Lotus	cloth,	1.35
Light on the Path	cloth, .85; leather,	1.50
Through the Gates of Gold	cloth,	1.20

The foregoing prices are now correct but all publishers make their prices to us subject to change without notice.

THE QUARTERLY BOOK DEPARTMENT,
P. O. Box 64, Station O, New York

Devotional: Bhagavad Gita; Fragments; From the Upanishads; Letters That Have Helped Me; Light on the Path; The Parables of the Kingdom; The Song of Life; Through the Gates of Gold; Voice of the Silence.

Philosophical: Abridgment of the Secret Doctrine; Five Years of Theosophy; Key to Theosophy; Reincarnation; The Secret Doctrine; Talks on Religion; Theosophical Glossary; Patanjali's Yoga Sutras.

Introductory: Culture of Concentration; Esoteric Buddhism; Idyll of the White Lotus; Meditation; The Occult World; The Ocean of Theosophy; The Theosophical Society and Theosophy.

The Theosophical Society

Founded by H. P. Blavatsky at New York in 1875

THE Society does not pretend to be able to establish at once a universal brotherhood among men, but only strives to create the nucleus of such a body. Many of its members believe that an acquaintance with the world's religions and philosophies will reveal, as the common and fundamental principle underlying these, that "spiritual identity of all Souls with the Oversoul" which is the basis of true brotherhood; and many of them also believe that an appreciation of the finer forces of nature and man will still further emphasize the same idea.

The organization is wholly unsectarian, with no creed, dogma, nor personal authority to enforce or impose; neither is it to be held responsible for the opinions of its members, who are expected to accord to the beliefs of others that tolerance which they desire for their own.

The following proclamation was adopted at the Convention of the Society, held at Boston, April, 1895:

"The Theosophical Society in America by its delegates and members in Convention assembled, does hereby proclaim fraternal good will and kindly feeling toward all students of Theosophy and members of Theosophical Societies wherever and however situated. It further proclaims and avers its hearty sympathy and association with such persons and organizations in all theosophical matters except those of government and administration, and invites their correspondence and co-operation.

"To all men and women of whatever caste, creed, race, or religious belief, who aim at the fostering of peace, gentleness, and unselfish regard one for another, and the acquisition of such knowledge of men and nature as shall tend to the elevation and advancement of the human race, it sends most friendly greeting and freely proffers its services.

"It joins hands with all religions and religious bodies whose efforts are directed to the purification of men's thoughts and the bettering of their ways, and it avows its harmony therewith. To all scientific societies and individual searchers after wisdom upon whatever plane, and by whatever righteous means pursued, it is and will be grateful for such discovery and unfoldment of Truth as shall serve to announce and confirm a *scientific basis for ethics*.

"And lastly, it invites to its membership those who, seeking a higher life hereafter, would learn to know the *path* to tread in this."

Applications for membership should be addressed to the

Secretary T. S., P. O. Box 64, Station O, New York.